



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

19980515 153

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

DMC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-90-002

CONTENTS

23 JANUARY 1990

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

SOUTH AFRICA

Deputy Minister Says Naval Expansion 'Unlikely' [Johannesburg Radio 21 Dec]	1
Defense Force May Disband Marine Corps [CAPE TIMES 29 Dec]	1

CHINA

Building Defense Reserves Urged [JIEFANGJUN BAO 25 Nov]	2
Space Industry To Take 'Major Stride in 1990' [XINHUA 22 Dec]	2
PLA Develops Large Nuclear Test Device [ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE 14 Dec]	3
Military Industry Turns to Civilian Production [Z. Daqiang; ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE 20 Dec]	3
French Warship Sale to Taiwan Viewed	4
Foreign Ministry Spokesman [Hong Kong AFP 4 Jan]	4
French Premier's Office [XINHUA 4 Jan]	4
Reaction to France-Taiwan Frigate Negotiations [RENMIN RIBAO 6 Jan]	5
France's Warship Sale Decision [XINHUA 11 Jan]	5
Arms Production To Decline 45 Percent [XINHUA 15 Jan]	5

EAST ASIA

JAPAN

Japan's Defense Budget for FY 1990 Revealed	6
Defense Budget Below 1% of GNP [KYODO 22 Dec]	6
Further on Defense Spending [KYODO 24 Dec]	6
Government Approves National Defense Budget [KYODO 28 Dec]	6
Japan Prepared To Increase Defense Burden Share [KYODO 7 Jan]	7
Japan Rejects Naval Power Reductions [M. Mabuchi; KYODO 10 Jan]	8

NORTH KOREA

Mongolia, USSR Support Nuclear-Free Zone [KCNA 28 Dec]	8
Daily Urges U.S. Change on Denuclearization [KCNA 12 Jan]	8
South's Purchase of British Jets Denounced [KCNA 12 Jan]	9
Creation of Nuclear-Free Peace Zone Urged [KCNA 13 Jan]	9

SOUTH KOREA

Military Reorganization Plan Revealed	9
New Structure Explained [H. Ki-pong; HANGUK ILBO 25 Oct]	9
Impact, Prospects [K. Hyong-pae; HANGYORE SINMUN 25 Oct]	11
Egypt, Syria Seek North Korean Help in Missile Development	12
Syria Cancels Deal with China [Seoul Radio 29 Dec]	12
Soviet Scud Missiles Antiquated [THE KOREA TIMES 30 Dec]	12
Defense Minister Expects North-South Arms Talks [Yi Sang-hun; THE KOREA HERALD 1 Jan]	13

TAIWAN

Defense Minister Discusses Arms Purchase [Taipei International 24 Dec]	14
Further on Reported French Warship Agreement	14
Mainland Warns France [Taipei Radio 29 Dec]	14
France Refuses Comment [Taipei Radio 31 Dec]	15

Ministry Declines Comment on French Frigate Deal [CNA 4 Jan]	15
Official Says Satellite for 'Peaceful' Purposes [CNA 4 Jan]	15
France Rescinds Offer To Sell Frigates [Taipei Radio 11 Jan]	15

EAST EUROPE

INTRABLOC AFFAIRS

Modrow Meets With Warsaw Pact's Lushev [East Berlin ADN 10 Jan]	16
Nemeth Says Ryzhkov Agrees on Troop Withdrawal [Budapest Radio 13 Jan]	16
CSSR Commentary on Soviet Troop Withdrawal [M. Sundic; Zagreb Radio 14 Jan]	16
Prague Soviet Troop Withdrawal Talks Open 15 Jan [Prague Radio 15 Jan]	17
CSSR-USSR Troop Withdrawal Talks Adjourn [Prague Radio 16 Jan]	17

BULGARIA

Bulgarian Daily Denounces U.S. Action in Panama [S. Dimova; RABOTNICHESKO DELO 22 Dec]	17
---	----

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Defense Minister on Army's Reorganization [M. Vacek; RUDE PRAVO 16 Dec]	17
Army, Peace Council View Alternative Service [CTK 19 Dec]	18
CSSR Reacts to U.S. 'Intervention' in Panama	19
Foreign Ministry Issues Statement [Bratislava Radio 22 Dec]	19
Human Rights Group Voices Concern [CTK 24 Dec]	19
Commentary Condemns Intervention [J. Nyvlt; RUDE PRAVO 21 Dec]	19
Army Begins Disarming People's Militia [PRAVDA 23 Dec]	20
Brno Military Airfield Gradually Phased Out [RUDE PRAVO 29 Dec]	20
Dobrovsky: Soviet Troop Withdrawal in 1990 [Prague TV 9 Jan]	20
Spokesman on Withdrawal of Soviet Troops [Prague Radio 9 Jan]	20
Soviet Troop Withdrawal Urged by Party, Populace	20
Soviet Military Project Halted [Prague Radio 12 Jan]	20
Rally Urges Troop Withdrawal [CTK 14 Jan]	21
Party Supports Stand on Troops [Prague Radio 14 Jan]	21
Timetable Proposed for Soviet Troop Withdrawal [Prague Radio 17 Jan]	21

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Committee Endorses Draft Military Doctrine [ADN 20 Dec]	21
GDR Commentary Condemns U.S. Action in Panama [M. Tkalec; BERLINER ZEITUNG 21 Dec]	22
GDR Media Criticizes U.S. Invasion of Panama	22
Panama Canal Treaty at Issue [B. Graessler; NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 22 Dec]	22
Further Commentary [B. Graessler; NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 29 Dec]	23
GDR Commentaries Berate U.S. Action in Panama	23
East Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG Commentary [B. Adam; BERLINER ZEITUNG 2 Jan]	23
East Berlin TV Commentary [East Berlin TV 4 Jan]	24
Defense Minister on Need for Army [T. Hoffmann; NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 28 Dec]	24

HUNGARY

Assembly Authorizes Soviet Withdrawal Stance [MTI 5 Jan]	27
NATO Delegation Arrives in Budapest [MTI 16 Jan]	27

POLAND

Polish Navy Commander Interviewed on Military [P. Kolodziejczyk; DZIENNIK BALTYCKI 17 Nov]	27
'Soviets Go Home' Slogans, Rallies Reported [ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 18 Dec]	29

Poland Reacts to U.S. Invasion of Panama	30
U.S. Action Condemned [ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 21 Dec]	30
U.S. Invasion 'Unjustifiable' [Z. Slomkowski; TRYBUNA LUDU 21 Dec]	30
Anti-Soviet Demonstration Held in Legnica [Warsaw Radio 12 Jan]	31
Warsaw Radio on Armed Forces Reductions [Warsaw Radio 15 Jan]	31

ROMANIA

Defense Minister on Strengths of Securitate, Army [Budapest Radio 23 Dec]	32
King Michael Urges Warsaw Pact Intervention [Paris AFP 23 Dec]	32
Soviet Embassy Promises Military Help [Bucharest Radio 23 Dec]	32
Anti-Ceausescu Forces Seek Soviet Help [Bucharest Radio 23 Dec]	32

YUGOSLAVIA

Slovene LC Congress Condemns U.S. in Panama [TANJUG Domestic Service 23 Dec]	32
SFRY Media Reacts to U.S. Invasion of Panama [BORBA 23-24 Dec]	33

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

EGYPT

Soviet Denies Guarantee to Israel on Syrian Arms [AL-WAFD 25 Dec]	34
'Abd-al-Majid on Peace Process, Nuclear Arms [MENA 28 Dec]	34

INDIA

Indian-Pakistani Nuclear Facility Pact Ready [Delhi Radio 13 Jan]	34
---	----

PAKISTAN

Pact To Not Attack Nuclear Facilities Delayed [DAWN 7 Jan]	35
--	----

SOVIET UNION

Max Kampelman on U.S.-Soviet Relations, Arms Control [MOSCOW NEWS No 46, 19-26 Nov]	36
Commentary on U.S. Forces, Policies in Pacific Area [Yu. Petrov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Dec]	37
Soviet Anti-Nuclear Movement To Hold Congress on Eve of Summit [O. Suleimenov; MOSCOW NEWS No 51, 24-31 Dec]	38

WEST EUROPE

EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

Defense Doctrine, Balance of Forces Reviewed [Paris LE FIGARO 27 Nov]	40
Franco-German Combat Helicopter Agreement [J. Isnard; Paris LE MONDE 1 Dec]	41
Eastern Events May Affect Defense Posture [J. Isnard; Paris LE MONDE 28 Nov]	41
NATO's Woerner on Impact of E. Europe Events [M. Woerner Madrid ABC 15 Dec]	43

DENMARK

Danish Navy Accepts First Flex 300 Modular Ship [BERLINGSKE TIDENDE 20 Dec]	44
---	----

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

FRG's Genscher Urges Security Cooperation Measures [H-D. Genscher; VIERTELJAHRRESSCHRIFT FUER SICHERHEIT UND FRIEDEN Oct 89]	45
Background to FRG Troop Cuts Analyzed [H. Schueler; DIE ZEIT 15 Dec]	49
U.S. Chemical Weapons Removal Reported [DER SPIEGEL 25 Dec]	50
Head of NATO on Arms Reduction, German Unity [DPA 27 Dec]	53
'Secret' Plans To Reduce Military Service [DPA 6 Jan]	53
CDU-CSU Favors New 'European Security Union' [DPA 6 Jan]	54

Government Dismisses Bundeswehr Reductions	[DPA 8 Jan]	54
Stoltenburg Urges More Superpower Troop Cuts	[DPA 9 Jan]	54

FRANCE

French Defense Minister Interviewed on European Defense		
[J-P. Chevenement; Paris Radio 19 Dec]		55
Planned Sale of Frigates to Taiwan Brings Chinese Reaction		56
Sale of Frigates Authorized	[AFP 3 Jan]	56
PRC Opposes Sale	[AFP 4 Jan]	56
Chevenement Dismisses GDR Troop-Cut Proposal	[Paris Radio 7 Jan]	56
Defense Minister Chevenement on Hades Missile	[LE MONDE 7-8 Jan]	56
Decision on Warships for Taiwan Confirmed		57
Negotiations Stopped	[Beijing XINHUA 10 Jan]	57
Frigate Sale Cancelled	[AFP 9 Jan]	57
Defense Minister Comments on Disarmament	[LE MONDE 12 Jan]	57

ITALY

First of 2 Italian Destroyers Nearing Completion	[M. Modugno; IL MESSAGGERO 30 Oct]	57
Andreotti Proposes Sharp East-West Arms Cut	[L'UNITA 9 Jan]	58

NORWAY

Disarmament Seen to Increase Need for Satellite Surveillance		
[K. Dragnes; AFTENPOSTEN 14 Dec]		58

SPAIN

Spanish Government Withdraws From NATO Frigate Program	[M. Abizanda; ABC 3 Jan]	60
--	--------------------------	----

TURKEY

Columnist Considers Debate on Military Cuts	[H. Ulman; GUNAYDIN 5 Jan]	60
Turkey to Get Only NF-5 Planes	[ANATOLIA 13 Jan]	61
Joint Production of Military Aircraft With Spain	[Ankara Radio 15 Jan]	61
Army Plans Buying French Mobile Army Radars	[Ankara TV 16 Jan]	61

SOUTH AFRICA

Deputy Minister Says Naval Expansion 'Unlikely'

*MB2112185689 Johannesburg Domestic Service
in Afrikaans 1400 GMT 21 Dec 89*

[Text] Deputy Defense Minister Wynand Breytenbach says it is unlikely that the South African Navy will be expanded in the near future.

He said this in a South African Broadcasting Corporation interview, during a visit to the Simonstown Naval Base.

Breytenbach said defense policy is linked to economic realities, and, because of the importance of the sea routes to South Africa, large scale expansion was not being considered at present.

He praised naval personnel for their outstanding work over the past year and said South Africa ought to be proud of the fleet's performance.

Defense Force May Disband Marine Corps

*MB0301074090 Cape Town CAPE TIMES in English
29 Dec 89 p 3*

[Text] One of the South African Defence Force's [SADF] elite units, the Marine Corps, may be disbanded next year as a result of recent cutbacks announced by President F.W. de Klerk.

Mr de Klerk announced earlier this month that certain SADF units and facilities would be closed after submissions by the SADF and ARMSCOR [Armaments Corporation of South Africa].

The main task of the marines was to patrol South Africa's harbours and coastal installations.

A naval headquarters spokesman said he could "not confirm or deny" the disbanding of the unit. But SADF sources said they had been told the marines would be disbanded next year.

Navy spokesman Captain Dirk Visser said the navy, "like the other arms of the service, was finalising plans for structural changes" which would be made public in the New Year.

Building Defense Reserves Urged*HK1312013589 Beijing JIEFANGJUN BAO
in Chinese 25 Nov 89 p 1*

[Commentator's article: "Build a Powerful National Defense Reserve Force"]

[Text] With the approval of the State Council and the Central Military Commission, the Chinese National Defense Ministry has recently commended a batch of advanced units and individuals engaged in the people's militia and reserve service work. This is indeed great news for people engaged in China's national defense reserve service work. Filled with great joy, we take this opportunity to extend our warm congratulations and pay our sincere tribute to all the advanced units and individuals that have recently been commended by the Chinese National Defense Ministry!

Since the 3d Plenary Session of the 11th CPC Central Committee, under the correct leadership of the CPC Central Committee, the State Council, and the Central Military Commission, our country's people's militia and reserve force work has made great achievements in promoting our country's overall economic construction and serving our country's national defense modernization after carrying out a series of readjustments. Thus a large number of advanced units and individuals have emerged in this process. Those who have recently been commended by the Chinese National Defense Ministry are the outstanding representatives of a very large number of advanced units and individuals. The broad masses of our cadres, militiamen, and reserve force personnel must respond timely to the call made by the Chinese National Defense Ministry and learn from these advanced units and individuals by adhering more closely to the four cardinal principles and adopting a firmer political stand in opposing bourgeois liberalization. The broad masses of our cadres, militiamen, and reserve force personnel must also learn from these advanced units and individuals by further developing their patriotic spirit of showing profound love for our motherland and devoting themselves to China's national defense cause; their heroic revolutionary spirit of fearing neither hardship, bloodshed, nor death; and their spirit of boldly carrying out reforms, making progress, and striving for success amidst enormous difficulties. The broad masses of our cadres, militiamen, and reserve force personnel must also learn from these advanced units and individuals by redoubling efforts in their work and by making more contributions to the building and strengthening of China's national defense reserve force and to the realization of four modernizations in China.

The recently convened 5th Plenary Session of the 13th CPC Central Committee and the Enlarged Meeting of the Central Military Commission have put forward the principle of furthering the campaign of improving the economic environment, rectifying the economic order and deepening the on-going reform as well as higher demands on our people's militia and national defense

reserve service work. Hence we must steadfastly implement and carry out all the decisions made by the CPC Central Committee and the Central Military Commission. We must also, under the guidance of the spirit of the 5th Plenary Session of the 13th CPC Central Committee and the spirit of the Enlarged Meeting of the Central Military Commission, further implement the principle of integrating a small but efficient conventional army with a strong national defense reserve force, a principle which was formulated by the Central Authorities; make redoubled efforts to strengthen our people's militia and national defense reserve service work in border and coastal regions, in big and medium-sized cities, and in areas inhabited by ethnic minorities; and make unremitting efforts to strengthen our education in our party's basic line and on national defense among the broad masses of our militiamen and national defense reserve service personnel with a view to heightening their consciousness in adhering to the four cardinal principles, opposing bourgeois liberalization, and strengthening their national defense concept. We must make every possible endeavor to guarantee our party's absolute leadership over our people's militia and our national defense reserve force and enable our people's militia and our national defense reserve force to ideologically and politically keep in line with the CPC Central Committee in their actions, make increased efforts in their work, and make more contributions to the building of a powerful national defense reserve force in China!

Space Industry To Take 'Major Stride in 1990'*OW2212185089 Beijing XINHUA in English
0629 GMT 22 Dec 89*

[Text] Beijing, Dec 22 (XINHUA)—China's aero-space industry is ready to take a major stride in 1990, says a senior official of the Ministry of Aero-Space Industry.

In 1990, China will launch an unprecedented number of telecommunications satellites for both international and domestic clients. In total, 10 items of important experiments in the fields of aerospace technology and missiles will be carried out, and more satellites will be launched than in any past year, Jiao Yong, the ministry's spokesman, said yesterday.

On top of that, the aero-space industry is to launch 10 major experimental projects next year to upgrade China's space technology, he said.

As the 1980s draw to a close, China's aero-space policy-makers and designers are drafting a blueprint to promote the industry "in all directions" during the coming decade, not only to strengthen itself, but also to reinforce other sectors of the national economy, "CHINA DAILY" reported today.

China has so far launched 25 satellites for different purposes. It is scheduled to manufacture and launch dozens of satellites of diversified functions during the upcoming Eighth Five-Year Plan period (1991-1995), to

serve telecommunications, weather forecasts, earth resources survey and other uses of global observation.

Next year will see China's rocket launching service stride into international market for the first time.

China will use its modified Long March 3 rockets to put into orbit the Asiasat-1, a telecommunications satellite produced in the United States for the Asia Satellite Telecommunications Co. Ltd in next spring at the Xichang launching site in Sichuan Province, according to a launching contract signed last January.

Once in orbit, the satellite will mainly relay TV programs and will be able to cover most of Asia.

"Our preparation is going on smoothly," said Jiao, adding that China will honor all launching contracts signed with foreign customers and go for more contracts. "We are confident of our ability," he said.

On the other hand, during the first half of this year, 73 percent of what the industry produced was for civilian consumption, but the sales have been affected because of the nationwide market slump.

According to Jiao, the industry's civilian production will see its growth rate kept within 6 percent next year.

Priorities will go to the production of equipment for such infrastructures as communication, power and telecommunications, development of export-oriented machinery and electrical products, machines to replace imported ones that are worn out, and expanding exports of aerospace products and technology.

PLA Develops Large Nuclear Test Device

HK2712040689 Beijing ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE in Chinese 0944 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Beijing, 14 Dec (ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE)—A large test device which simulates the shock waves caused by nuclear explosions—"Anti-Shock Wave Tube 1485"—was successfully developed by a unit of the People's Liberation Army.

In order to achieve all kinds of data about the damages caused by the shock waves of a nuclear explosion to military facilities, it is necessary to create huge instantaneous shock waves by some artificial means. The research institutes concerned studied the methods of high-pressure electric discharges, explosions through the mixture of hydrogen and oxygen, and cone-shaped dynamite. Finally, they selected a kind of small-density gunpowder as the energy sources for creating the shock waves.

The test device was built in Luoyang, Henan. It is 42 meters long, 1,485 millimeters in diameter, and weighs 340 tons. It winds on the land like a huge dragon. It is the largest among similar devices in Asia.

The shock waves created by this device are similar to those caused by nuclear explosions, so much test data

can be obtained through its operation. The successful development of such a device enabled China to rank among the small number of advanced countries in the world which possess large anti-shock wave tubes. While nuclear explosions for test purposes are subject to more and more restrictions, the simulating test devices will have more extensive use.

Since the device was put into use, some 30 to 40 large test simulations have been carried out to test the shock strength of some defense works, some construction projects, and some weapons. Accurate results were achieved in these tests. In the test simulations for a large underground project, more than 2,000 bits of data were achieved through testing 14 different slope models. This provides the foundation for studying the impact of the shock waves on different parts of hills and valleys and for rationalizing the distribution of the underground structures. In particular, the tests achieved a more accurate empirical formula for calculating the relationship between the pressure and the topographical features, and this can be more effectively used in the relevant engineering projects.

Military Industry Turns to Civilian Production

HK2812061789 Beijing ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE in Chinese 0754 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Report by Zhu Daqiang (2612 1129 1730): "China's Military Industrial Enterprises Become an Important Component Part of China's Economic Construction"—ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE headline]

[Text] Beijing, 20 Dec (ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE)—With their unique technological advantages and tremendous machinery, equipment, and production capacity, China's military industrial enterprises have become an indispensable, important component part of the state's economic construction in peacetime.

Statistical data show that the military industrial enterprises have turned out over 10,000 civilian products in 40 major categories and that the production of several dozen "fist" products have been listed in the state plan. The value of civilian products turned out by the military industrial enterprises exceeds half of the total value of their own line of production.

For a long time, the characteristics of China's national defense industry have determined its independent, closed management system. Following the reform and opening up and driven by the need of the state's economic construction, the government has decided that the defense industry should turn to civilian needs.

As the center of China's high technology, the astronautics industry, which has launched satellites with its own carrier rockets, is rapidly shifting to the new stage of serving national economic construction. The communication satellites, recoverable-type [fan hui shi 6604 0932 1709] satellites, resource satellites, and meteorological

satellites have played an ever increasing role in all of the state's civilian departments.

The aeronautics industrial departments have achieved outstanding results in developing civilian aircraft and industrial gas turbines. They have developed and produced Yun-8 medium-range transport planes, Zhi-9 helicopters, Yun-12 all-purpose aircraft, and Yun-7 feeder aircraft. Meanwhile, the high-performance big passenger cars produced by the aeronautics industrial departments also demonstrate their exceptional characteristics in China's car market.

The peaceful use of nuclear energy is a direction which China's atomic industry has been pursuing in recent years. While vigorously developing nuclear power and other nuclear energy, China's atomic industry has also developed over 1,000 civilian products, such as isotope, rare earth, and geological prospecting.

The proportion of the output value of civilian products by the shipping industry accounts for over 90 percent of the total. In addition to shipbuilding, non-shipping products, such as offshore petroleum platforms and large ship locks, have also been developed. In the course of readjustments, the weapons industry has developed over 400 civilian products involving two major aspects, the means of subsistence and the means of production.

The military industrial enterprises have developed into many joint-production enterprise groups transcending departments, trades, and regions. Their products have succeeded in entering the international markets. By selling their products to 46 countries and regions, their export volume reached \$360 million last year.

French Warship Sale to Taiwan Viewed

Foreign Ministry Spokesman

HK0401130090 Hong Kong AFP in English 1252 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Beijing, Jan 4 (AFP)—The Chinese government Thursday reiterated its opposition to the planned sale of French warships to Taiwan, calling such a move "direct interference" in its internal affairs.

"We have already stated our opposition very clearly," said foreign ministry spokesman Jin Guihua.

"We are resolutely opposed to any country selling any kind of weapons and military equipment to Taiwan or the co-production thereof with Taiwan," he said.

Beijing has always considered Taiwan a province of China.

On Wednesday France announced it had authorized negotiation for the sale of six La Fayette-type warships to Taiwan.

Reliable sources said several more frigates could be sold at a later date, taking the total number to around 15.

Mr Jin said that if the sale were to take place, it would be considered a "direct interference in China's internal affairs."

(In Paris, a spokesman for the foreign ministry said Beijing's Ambassador to France, Zhou Jue, was received late Tuesday "at his request". The spokesman would not elaborate.

(But a spokesman for the Chinese embassy in Paris said that Mr Zhou had discussed the frigate issue with Foreign Minister Roland Dumas. "Our position has been clearly explained," he said.)

French officials stressed Wednesday that the sale concerned only hulls of the 1,200-tonne La Fayette-type frigate as well as electronic surveillance equipment. No arms were involved, they added.

The French authorization did not constitute "a change in policy toward China" and did "not affect its security at all," they said. Nor did France intend to carry out the deal "in secret from Beijing authorities, who were informed."

Observers say a frigate sale could spark a major crisis in Franco-Sino relations, already at a low ebb since France began welcoming Chinese dissidents fleeing the country after the bloody June crackdown on pro-democracy demonstrators in Beijing.

French Premier's Office

HK0401151590 Beijing XINHUA in English 1509 GMT 4 Jan 90

["French Government Arrogantly Approves Sales of Warships to Taiwan"—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Paris, Jan 4 (XINHUA)—The French government, disregarding the serious warnings from the Chinese government, decided recently to permit the sale of six La Fayette light frigates to Taiwan.

The French Premier's Office confirmed the news and argued that France will sell only the frigate's hull and electronic monitoring facilities such as radar and sonar, instead of its military equipment such as missile and mine.

"The French government has not changed its policy towards China," the office said.

The frigate, a newly-developed warship which can tackle anti-submarine helicopters, is used for sea control, according to the Agence France-Presse (AFP) report. The frigate will service the French Navy from 1994, AFP added.

On December 28, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a press conference in Beijing that the sale of military equipment to Taiwan or co-production of military equipment with Taiwan, whether directly or indirectly, in a complete or partial manner, constitutes direct interference in China's internal affairs.

Reaction to France-Taiwan Frigate Negotiations

HK0801093090 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese
6 Jan 89 p 4

[Unattributed report: "French Government Has the Impudence To Permit the Sale of Warships to Taiwan"]

[Text] Paris, 4 Jan—The newspapers in Paris today published a piece of news provided by the French Premier's Office, which revealed that the French Government has approved the sale to Taiwan of six frigates worth about 10 billion francs.

The news said talks on the sale have entered their final stages. After the signing of the contract, Taiwan is entitled to place an order for nine more frigates.

According to sources, the frigates offered to Taiwan are advanced naval crafts La Fayette, which the French navy has not put into service. La Fayette is equipped with missiles, anti-submarine helicopters, 100 mm guns, and electronic and satellite communication equipment.

The Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out on 28 December in Beijing that China is resolutely opposed to the sale to or co-production with Taiwan of any kind of weapons or military equipment by any country, whether directly or indirectly, or in a partial or complete manner; that such actions constitute direct interference in China's internal affairs. The French Government explained in defense that since only the frigate's hull and communication equipment, instead of its military equipment, are sold to Taiwan, the frigates cannot be seen as military ware. Public opinion here has observed that the move by the French Government will create "a serious diplomatic crisis" between France and China.

France's Warship Sale Decision

OW1101083690 Beijing XINHUA in English
0826 GMT 11 Jan 90

[Text] Beijing, January 11 (XINHUA)—China appreciates France's decision not to sell warships to Taiwan, a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman said here today.

"It is wise for the French Government to make such a decision in line with the guidelines of the agreement on the establishment of the Sino-French diplomatic relations and with the overall situation concerning the bilateral relationship and we appreciate such a decision. This will be conducive to improving and developing the Sino-French relations," the spokesman said.

Arms Production To Decline 45 Percent

OW1501071090 Beijing XINHUA in English
0639 GMT 15 Jan 90

[Text] Beijing, January 15 (XINHUA)—About two-thirds of China's arms manufacturers will become military-civilian producers by 1992.

This year, the government is planning to cut arms production by 45 percent compared with last year's actual output, CHINA DAILY reported today.

However, "the production and research of military products will be guaranteed in any condition", the paper quoted Zou Jiahua, state councillor and minister of the State Planning Commission, as saying.

Zou made the remarks at a national weaponry conference which was held here over the weekend.

With the army having been reduced and the government placing higher priority on economy, orders for Chinese military manufacturers have been decreasing since 1979, Zou said.

Lai Jinlie, president of the China North Industries Group (NORIN), said the group has invested 2.15 billion yuan (457 million U.S. dollars) into non-military production since 1979. Civilian production has kept increasing at an annual rate of 25 percent.

Civilian products accounted for 60 percent of the group's total output value last year, Lai said. These products included cars, motors, freight trains, refrigerators and cameras.

JAPAN

Japan's Defense Budget for FY 1990 Revealed

Defense Budget Below 1% of GNP

OW2312111989 Tokyo KYODO in English 1304 GMT
22 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec 22 (KYODO)—Japan's defense spending for fiscal 1990 will amount to less than 1 percent of its gross national product (GNP), falling below the 1 percent ceiling for the first time in four years, government sources said Friday. The cabinet has decided to set the nominal GNP for 1990, based on the economic forecast, to 417.2 trillion yen, up 5.2 percent from this year, they said.

The Defense Agency is demanding about 4.17 trillion yen for the fiscal 1990 budget, up 6.35 percent from the current fiscal year. This will amount to 0.999 percent of the project GNP.

"One can say 4 trillion yen is a huge quantity but more than 10 trillion yen is slated for the welfare budget and another 10 trillion yen is allocated for education spending. The world can see that Japan is frugal on defense spending," Minister of State for Defense Juro Matsumoto said.

Former Prime Minister Takeo Miki in 1976 set the limit of the defense budget to under 1 percent of the GNP. But in January 1987, then Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone removed the ceiling, after setting the fiscal 1987 military budget to 1.004 percent of the GNP.

Further on Defense Spending

OW2412124489 Tokyo KYODO in English 0422 GMT
24 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec 24 (KYODO)—The Finance Ministry held defense spending to under the controversial 1 percent level of the nation's projected gross national product (GNP) in its draft budget for the 1990 fiscal year released on Sunday. The ministry rejected Defense Agency requests for some big-ticket items in the fifth and final year of its mid-term defense program.

Given changed international circumstances, the draft rejects a Defense Agency attempt at "efficient and balanced" armaments funding for ships and planes. Bargaining between the agency and finance officials before the finalized government budget to be presented later this week is expected to push up the 4.14 trillion yen provisional figure, already representing a 5.5 percent rise from the current fiscal year.

Government forecasts of a 417.2 trillion yen GNP in fiscal 1990, a 5.2 percent annual rise in nominal terms, put defense spending at just 0.991 percent. Officials said the high GNP level had "naturally" put the defense budget under 1 percent.

If maintained, the less than 1 percent total would be the first in four years. The restriction of defense spending to 1 percent of the nation's GNP, initiated in 1976, was first breached in the 1987 fiscal year. Deliberations last year pushed the figure to 1.006 percent in the finalized budget. But even if the ministry accepts the defense agency's requests for 4.17 trillion yen, a 6.35 percent annual increase as detailed this August, the total will remain just below the 1 percent mark at 0.999 percent.

Standardized calculations of military strength used by the NATO alliance make Japan the third highest defense spender in the world. Defense experts point to high personnel expenses and a high value of the yen against the dollar to account for the amount.

The Finance Ministry refused funding requests for the DDG (guided missile destroyer) and three other missile-carrying warships, but approved a submarine and sonar-equipped vessel for detecting submarine movements. The vessel is designed to relay information to an anti-submarine warfare center to be built at the U.S. Naval Base at Yokosuka, south of Tokyo. The draft also cuts the number of aircraft requested including the F-15 fighter and the T-4 trainer, recently grounded after a series of accidents.

Defense Agency hopes for a 13.2 percent rise for research and development were thwarted, the ministry allotting only 93.7 million yen of 104 million yen requested. By far the majority of domestically-built weaponry is made under U.S. license and aircraft developed in Japan have been cited for design flaws.

But in the only response to U.S. demands to bear a larger share of base costs, the ministry did approve a boost in the present 75 percent share of benefit payments to Japanese employees on U.S. bases paid by Tokyo to a full 100 percent.

Government Approves National Defense Budget

OW2912002689 Tokyo KYODO in English 1626 GMT
28 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec 29 (KYODO)—The Government Friday approved a national defense budget for the 1990 fiscal year totaling just under 1 percent of the gross national product (GNP) estimate but including sufficient funds for front-line weaponry to fulfill the country's military buildup plans. The double-edged budget for the year starting next April offers a substantial reply to U.S. calls to its Pacific ally for a strengthened military stance, while checking domestic concerns about exceeding the self-imposed 1 percent limit.

The 4,159.3 billion yen sum marks a 6.1 percent rise from the current fiscal year, weighing in at 0.997 percent of the Finance Ministry's 1990 GNP estimate of 417.2 trillion yen. This is the first time in 4 years the budget figure has not exceeded the 1 percent mark. The 1

percent goal, initiated in fiscal 1976, was first breached in fiscal 1987 under then Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone.

Ministry officials said defense spending "naturally" came under the 1 percent mark due to the high GNP when presenting their draft budget December 24. But negotiations between the Defense Agency and the ministry pushed the figure over the ministry's declared aim of holding the budget to a 6 percent rise. Defense officials argued successfully for the "reactivation" of funds slated for a new group of high-tech tanks, additional warplanes, and missile-carrying vessels to satisfy goals slated for the final year of its 5-year mid-term buildup program. Further modernization measures are to be carried out under a new outline yet to be finalized.

The agency's research and development program received virtually all of some 104 billion yen requested for projects including the joint Japan-U.S. FSX fighter plane and new guided missile and communications technology. Some 34.6 billion yen for FSX-related contracts were approved though the total includes payments extending beyond the 1990 fiscal year.

While Japan's domestic arms industry supplies most of the nation's weaponry, about half of the production is carried out under technical license arrangements with U.S. companies. Disputes with the U.S. over the FSX fighter are thought to have firmed the agency's resolve to strengthen domestic capability in arms technology. The Finance Ministry decided to fund most of the search and surveillance craft called for in the buildup program as well as new F-15 fighter planes to replace the defense force's aging fleet.

After rejecting requests for an Aegis multiple-targeting equipped vessel, the last of nine guided-missile destroyers, and three missile-bearing vessels, the ministry reinstated funds for the destroyer and two of the smaller ships. Most antisubmarine aircraft requested were also approved. The budget includes no funds for a new escort vessel for plutonium shipments to and from Europe to be built under the direction of Japan's coast guard authority, the Maritime Safety Agency.

The ability of a strengthened Japanese naval force to detect Soviet submarine movements is a key part of U.S. strategy for Japan to assume more of the defense burden in the Pacific. The perceived Soviet threat also loomed large behind Defense Agency requests for 30 advanced model tanks, at first rejected but reinstated in full after negotiations.

The northern island of Hokkaido is considered the most likely area for a Soviet invasion and a large part of Japan's land armaments and soldiers are stationed there. In Washington, U.S. officials had informal statements of praise for the budget, saying the strengthened defense stance contributed to global peace and prosperity. The U.S. announced cuts in its own defense budget just before the U.S.-Soviet summit in Malta which declared a

symbolic end to the cold war. But lessening superpower tensions in Europe have not yet been paralleled in Asia.

While praising the summit, Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu supported Defense Agency arguments that continuing instability on the Korean peninsula and in Southeast Asia, coupled with Soviet arms deployments in Asia, made continued military modernization necessary. The 6.2 percent rise in defense spending accompanied an 8.2 percent jump in Official Development Assistance funding, another area where the U.S. has sought a greater Japanese contribution.

Other Asian nations have reacted negatively in the past to signs of increased Japanese military power, their sensitivity stemming from wartime memories of invasion. A ruling party majority virtually assures the budget's passage in the House of Representatives.

Japan Prepared To Increase Defense Burden Share

OW0701100090 Tokyo KYODO in English 0929 GMT
7 Jan 90

[Text] Tokyo, Jan 7 (KYODO)—Japan is prepared to amend a special agreement under the Japan-U.S. Status of Forces Agreement to allow Japan to shoulder more of the financial burden of stationing U.S. military forces in Japan, government sources said Sunday. Foreign Ministry sources said the possible new Japanese financing would be used to pay salaries of Japanese employees and base facility management fees. Japan has refused to shoulder such costs on grounds that they were not part of the Status of Forces Agreement regarding burden sharing. The special agreement, implemented in June 1987 amid mounting U.S. pressure for more Japanese defense burden sharing, is due to expire in 1991. The pact states that Japan must pay some of the allowances of Japanese employees working at U.S. bases.

The deal was needed to supplement the 1952 Status of Forces Agreement, which said the United States must bear the costs of facility management and allowances of Japanese base workers. Concerned government departments will start coordinating efforts to amend the special agreement to include such cost items, the sources said.

U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney is expected to ask Tokyo to provide more money for U.S. Forces in Japan, as well as increased burden sharing in other areas when he visits here following a general election expected for February 18, the sources said.

"Right now, the U.S. is keeping quiet out of consideration for the Japanese Government and the ruling Liberal Democratic Party ahead of the election. But as soon as the election is over, the U.S. Government will be forced by Congress to loudly demand more defense sharing," a Foreign Ministry source said.

President George Bush approved a defense bill last month requiring the U.S. to negotiate an agreement with

Japan to offset U.S. costs of maintaining forces in Japan. Japan agreed to assume welfare costs for Japanese base employees in the 1987 special agreement, along with retirement allowances and other bills. Japan will provide full financing for the agreed upon areas by 1990.

Japan has been setting aside a portion of its budget since 1978 to help ease the financial burden of the U.S., which was hard hit by the yen's appreciation. The amount of the budget dispersed for this purpose since 1978 reached 365 billion yen in 1989, the highest amount among U.S. allies. When added to the fiscal 1990 budget allocation of 13.7 billion yen, the cost of helping keep U.S. Forces here could top 400 billion yen.

Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama has said Japan will make its own decision regarding burden sharing, but Foreign Ministry sources said Japan will try to satisfy specific demands the U.S. makes on the matter.

Japan Rejects Naval Power Reductions

OW1001191290 Tokyo KYODO in English 1535 GMT 10 Jan 90

[Untitled article by Mitsuru Mabuchi]

[Text] Brussels, January 10 (KYODO)—Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu told a top NATO official Wednesday [10 January] that Japan is not ready to consider any substantial reduction in its naval power as the Soviet Union is still boosting its military muscle in the Far East, Foreign Ministry officials said.

Kaifu told Manfred Woerner, general secretary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) that the Soviet Union has so far failed to apply its "new thinking" in diplomacy to Asia, and is continuing to bolster its military strength in the region.

Kaifu said Japan can not, at least at the moment, give any serious consideration to a major cut in naval forces which he said are crucial to the military balance in the Asia-Pacific arena, according to the officials.

Woerner reportedly agreed with Kaifu's view, saying NATO is in the same position as Japan with regard to its naval forces.

Kaifu explained that the bilateral dispute over Soviet-held islands off Hokkaido, which Japan claims as its territories, is blocking any drastic improvement in Japan-Soviet ties.

But Japan is hoping that a scheduled visit by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev next year will supply a diplomatic break-through, which could lead to a peace treaty.

Kaifu and Woerner also agreed that Japan and NATO should step up their political dialog since security issues should be assessed from a global point of view.

They also concurred that the current radical changes in the international political structure are primarily a product of firm solidarity among Western countries.

Woerner noted he has noticed a change in the Soviet attitude toward NATO, which the communist country now acknowledges as a stabilizing factor.

While expressing his appreciation of the change in Soviet foreign policy as shown in East Europe, Kaifu said Western nations nevertheless should keep a cautious eye on Soviet military activities.

NORTH KOREA

Mongolia, USSR Support Nuclear-Free Zone

SK2812061089 Pyongyang KCNA in English 0508 GMT 28 Dec 89

[Text] Pyongyang Dec 28 (KCNA)—A communique on the talks between the foreign ministers of Mongolia and the Soviet Union expressed full support to the DPRK's proposal for turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, the Mongolian paper UNEN December 23 reported.

The foreign ministers admitted that to ease the tensions on the Korean peninsula and peacefully resolve the Korean question conform to the interests of all countries in this region, the communique said.

It noted that Mongolia and the Soviet Union support the proposal of the DPRK to convert the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

Daily Urges U.S. Change on Denuclearization

SK1201064290 Pyongyang KCNA in English 0509 GMT 12 Jan 90

[Unattributed article: "The United States Must Discard Wrong Stand"]

[Text] Pyongyang, January 12 (KCNA)—NODONG SINMUN today hits out at the United States' opposition to the denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula.

Recalling that, although over two months have passed since the DPRK proposed a three-way negotiation among the DPRK, the United States and South Korea to convert the Korean peninsula into nuclear free zone, the U.S. authorities have not yet given an answer to it, the news analyst says:

The denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula, which means removing one of the most dangerous hotbeds of nuclear war in the world, stands out with great urgency not only for peace in Korea but also for peace in the world.

The Korean peninsula has become a dangerous hotbed of nuclear war because the United States has brought huge

aggression forces and nuclear weapons into South Korea and turned it into the largest nuclear forward base in the Far East directed against the DPRK and socialist countries. Accordingly, the denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula is impossible in the absence of the United States. The U.S. is feigning ignorance, closing its eyes to this stark fact. But it can by no means evade its responsibility for the solution of the problem of the denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula.

If the United States truly wants peace and the relaxation of tensions on the Korean peninsula, it must not shun this problem but come out to the table of three-way negotiation to discuss and solve it.

South's Purchase of British Jets Denounced

*SK1201071290 Pyongyang KCNA in English
0453 GMT 12 Jan 90*

[Text] Pyongyang, January 12 (KCNA)—The South Korean puppet clique is planning to introduce 20 Hawk fighter planes from Britain, according to a report of the British paper TIMES.

The puppets are on the point of signing a contract for this with the British Aerospace Consortium.

The paper said that the South Korean puppet clique might wind up ordering about 100 fighters from the British aerospace.

The puppets had decided to take over 120 jet fighters from the United States and buy submarines from West Germany in order to step up war preparations against the North.

These moves of the puppet clique clearly show how feverishly they are running about for confrontation and provocation of a war against the North behind the curtain of dialogue with us.

Creation of Nuclear-Free Peace Zone Urged

*SK1301111090 Pyongyang KCNA in English
1056 GMT 13 Jan 90*

[Text] Pyongyang, January 13 (KCNA)—If a nuclear-free peace zone is created on the Korean peninsula, one of the most dangerous hotbeds of nuclear war in the world will be removed and a big advance will be made in maintaining peace in Asia and other parts of the world, stresses NODONG SINMUN in an article today.

To avert the danger of nuclear war and ensure peace on the Korean peninsula is a pressing task that must be solved for world peace, the author of the article says, and continues:

South Korea has now been converted into a combined nuclear arsenal filled with all sorts of nuclear weapons, means of nuclear delivery and nuclear bases and into a hotbed of nuclear war threatening peace in Asia and other parts of the world. Deployed in South Korea are

more than 1,000 pieces of nuclear weapons including neutron bombs called "devilish weapons of the 20th century". South Korea has become the area of highest density in nuclear deployment in the world. It is a prerequisite to overall peace and security in the world to ease military tensions and remove the danger of war on the Korean peninsula where the danger of nuclear war is greater than in any other areas of the world.

In order to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free, peace zone, it is imperative to withdraw U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea without delay. Pointing out that the U.S. reactionary ruling quarters are reinforcing nuclear forces and hastening preparations for a nuclear war in South Korea under the preposterous pretext of "protecting" South Korea from the "threat from the North", the article says:

We do not have a single piece of nuclear weapon. This is a fact recognized by the world. Furthermore, we are heading for the reduction of the armed forces equipped with conventional weapons. It is preposterous to talk about "threat from the North" and "nuclear deterrent force" against us. If the nuclear weapons in South Korea are levelled at other socialist countries, the United States must withdraw them since a nuclear arms reduction treaty was signed between the United States and the Soviet Union.

SOUTH KOREA

Military Reorganization Plan Revealed

New Structure Explained

*902C0053 Seoul HANGUK ILBO in Korean
25 Oct 89 p 5*

[Untitled article by Han Ki-pong]

[Text] An outline of the military reorganization plan (known as 818 Plan), which has been much criticized recently, has been unveiled to the public. On 24 October, Minister of National Defense Yi Sang-hun made a formal announcement of the reorganization plan that has been studied thus far, and said he will rush to create General Staff National Defense Headquarters and appoint its chief, which are the key factors of the reorganization plan, as soon as the plan is approved by the National Assembly.

According to the Ministry of National Defense, the planned military reorganization is part of the development of long-term defense systems, and in general, it is aimed at reorganizing the military's upper level structure into a more policy-oriented, efficient system run by a select few, while the troops under their commands will be organized into a combat-oriented, light-weight system.

Chain of Command

The minister of national defense will be responsible for both military administration and military command, which is the way it is now; but the responsibility for military command will be delegated to the national defense chief of the General Staff and the responsibility for military administration will be delegated to the chiefs of each military department.

Thus, through delegation from the minister of national defense, the national defense chief of the General Staff can exercise the power to control strategies of key operational commands of each military department. Depending on the effects of the reorganization, the structure of the key operational commands could change, but presently it consists of the First, Second, and Third Army Headquarters, Strategic Command Headquarters of the Navy and Air Force, and Headquarters of Special Forces. In other words, the national defense chief of the General Staff can bypass the chiefs of each military department and control strategies of the aforementioned commands.

Except for the power to control strategies, the chiefs of each military department will carry out their traditional duties, such as personnel administration, budgeting (including distribution of resources), administration of military justice, inspection, education and military training, preservation of military discipline and morale, etc.

The minister of national defense will retain his existing rights to personnel administration, budgeting, use of information, etc.

A close look at the functions of the upper level of the organization shows that the Ministry of National Defense will be responsible for development of national defense policies, acquisition and distribution of resources, and execution and control [of other duties]. The National Defense Headquarters of the General Staff will be responsible for reporting projected needs of military forces to the Ministry of National Defense and for the applications of military power. The headquarters of each military department will be responsible for preservation and development of the military force, military administration (including personnel administration), and supply of munitions.

According to the Ministry of National Defense, such a new organization and function of the military will be in line with the principle of civilian government because the national defense chief of the General Staff and the chiefs of each military department will be reporting to the minister of national defense, who will be assisted by the national defense chief of the General Staff in the area of commanding the strategic units.

Moreover, it is said that since the key power of the chiefs of each military department will be divided and restrained, the reorganization could be an effective way of preventing power concentration.

Structure of the National Defense Headquarters of the General Staff

The structure of the National Defense Headquarters of the General Staff will be based on the present structure of the Headquarters of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and part of its manpower will be transferred from the headquarters of each military department through reduction and adjustment of the personnel while maintaining the current level of the full strength. It will adopt a system in which the chiefs of headquarters are controlled in order to make the system of joint operations work, and will organize the following four units: Strategic Planning Headquarters (which is a combination of the Strategic Planning Bureau and the Bureau of Weapons System, both of which are currently under the Headquarters of the Joint Chiefs of Staff); Intelligence Headquarters (which is a continuation of the Intelligence Headquarters of the Joint Chiefs of Staff); Strategic Headquarters (which is a unification of strategic headquarters of each military department); and Support Headquarters (for personnel and military supply). Besides, it will create the following four offices: Office of the Combat Readiness Inspection which will take over the functions of the present Office of the Special Inspector that will be dissolved; Office of the Civil Psychological Warfare; Office of the Command Control Communications; and Office of the Secretary.

There will be first and second deputy chiefs under the national defense chief of the General Staff, and their military background will be different from that of the chief. Thus, if the chief is from the Army, the deputies will come either from the Navy or from the Air Force. The ratio of the strength of the General Staff will no longer be based on the ratio of the full strength of each military department, but will have a ratio of 2 to 1 to 1 for the Army, Navy and Air Force, respectively, which is said to ensure preservation of the traditional three forces and a balanced growth. The full strength of the National Defense Headquarters of the General Staff will be reportedly 1,000 some people.

Background

The military reorganization was previously attempted four times since 1969, but was held back because of the concerns over conflict of interests within the military and concentration of power when it was proposed to unify the functions of the military administration and military command.

However, because of the characteristics of the modern warfare, which require development of high-tech weapons that lead to an intensive surprise offensive as well as close cooperation of strategic elements among the military units, it has become necessary to maximize the combined war power of the three military departments. Hence, the renewed development of the reorganization plan. Another objective is to enhance the economics of managing the national defense resources through unification and abolition of overlapping functions of each

military department. In addition, because of the expected withdrawal of the U.S. Armed Forces in Korea, it is said, the reorganization is urgent in order to prepare for the transfer of operations and to cope with strategic circumstances of the future.

Joint Force vs. Unified Force

"Joint" and "unified" are military terms, and the Ministry of National Defense says the concept of our military reorganization plan is that of "joint." In general, the following military systems exist: Advisory System of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Korea and Japan); Controlled System of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (U.S.); System of the National Defense Chief of the General Staff (England, West Germany, France, and Australia); and Unified System of the Chief of the General Staff (System of Unified Military, North Korea, Israel, Canada, Turkey, and Taiwan).

The proposed reorganization plan is a European type; however, in view of the fact that the NATO nations have a system in which the national defense chief of the General Staff has the operational power at peacetime (the commander in chief of NATO takes over at wartime), the plan also carries some characteristics of the unified military system, in which its commander has the operational power at both wartime and peacetime. The Ministry of National Defense calls it the "Korean System of Joint Military."

As suggested in various military theses thus far, the military thinks it is desirable to place both functions of the military administration and the military command under the commander in chief in a unified system in order to deal with North Korean threats. However, the Ministry of National Defense stresses that in order to eliminate the possibility of hampering the civilian control and to promote a balanced growth of each military department, the unified military system has been ruled out.

Regarding the timing of creating the National Defense Headquarters of the General Staff, Minister of National Defense Yi Sang-hun said, "I will submit the reorganization proposal when the given conditions are fully met at the National Assembly." At present, because of the oppositions from the three opposition parties, the plan could possibly be revised to give reduced power to the national defense chief of the General Staff.

Impact, Prospects

902C0053 Seoul HANGYORE SINMUN in Korean
25 Oct 89 p 3

[Untitled article by Kim Hyong-pae]

[Text] The Ministry of National Defense announced its military reorganization plan (the 818 Plan) on 24 October, and repeatedly stressed, "The objective of this

plan is to enhance [the military's] combat readiness in a modern war which is characterized by an intensive surprise offensive."

In the process of making final decisions on the plan, the Ministry of National Defense studied four types of most common military systems in the world: 1) Uncontrolled System of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Korea, Japan and Argentina); 2) Controlled System of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (United States); 3) Joint System of the General Staff (England, West Germany, France, and Italy); 4) Unified System of the General Staff (Turkey, Israel, Taiwan, and most communist countries). Of these, the ministry focused on the types 3) and 4), and concluded that "the Unified System of the General Staff (a unified military system) is most desirable," thereby justifying its plan as a pure attempt to consolidate the war power.

However, this explanation indicates that the military reorganization proposal by the Ministry of National Defense is the first phase of the military reorganization and is prepared to meet the immediate need to obtain the National Assembly's approval.

In other words, it is revealed that our military favors the System of the Single Chief of the General Staff, in which the power of both military administration and military command is consolidated.

This is also revealed when the Ministry of National Defense said, "But if the power of military administration and military command is given to the national defense chief of the General Staff, the concentration of too much power could hamper civilian control, and elimination of the headquarters of the three military departments could lead to disorder and friction. Thus, we have finally decided not to adopt this system."

Since the bill of military reorganization will be laid before the National Assembly, the following items may be particularly noteworthy: Of the types 3) and 4), namely the Israeli and West German military systems, the Ministry of National Defense decided not to choose the West German system, in which the minister of national defense exercises the power of both military administration and military command through the chiefs of each military department and the national defense chief of the General Staff controls the national defense plans; instead, the ministry's basic model was the Israeli military system, in which the national defense chief of the General Staff can exercise the power of military command without going through the chiefs of each military command.

Also, regarding the recent plans to create the Headquarters of Unified Force, the Ministry of National Defense sensed a rise of doubts and negative movement in political circles and among the general public. The Ministry of National Defense repeatedly stressed, "The announced plan is not for a unified military system but for a joint military system," thereby trying to dissipate the criticism that it was only a tentative plan aimed at obtaining approval from the National Assembly.

In connection with this, at the main session of the National Assembly on 14 October, Minister of National Defense Yi Sang-hun said, "The new military system being proposed by the government is a system in which the power of military administration and military command is unified under the minister, but only the power of military command is delegated to the national defense chief of the General Staff," thereby clarifying the government's firm position in using the Israeli system as a model insofar as the power of military command is concerned.

It has been pointed out that the objective of this plan is to consolidate the military organizations to increase efficiency in management and distribution of national defense resources and to prepare for the future policy changes of the U.S. Armed Forces in Korea and the [expected] transfer of the operational power. This is apparent in the reorganization proposal that is based on the Israeli military system insofar as the power of military command is concerned.

However, the military reorganization plan failed three times in the past—once immediately after the Nixon doctrine in 1971 when former President Park Chung-hee was in power, once immediately after the end of the Vietnam war in 1975, and once during Chun Doo-hwan's reign—because of such negative effects as too much power assigned to the national defense chief of the General Staff as a result of overconcentration of the military power. In view of these experiences, a great deal of criticism is expected in the legislative process.

The government, too, is keenly aware that if the military power is concentrated in the Army, it could cause more serious doubts in the political circles and in the Navy and Air Force, whose members are concerned about the past experiences wherein the military power was abused by some of the Army generals even under the present system of the three military departments which is viewed as the most ideal in a civilian government. And, in fact, there were the events of 16 May, 12 December, and 17 May, that add worries to the general public. Thus, the government expects hardships in the legislative process.

If this plan is implemented, the power of the headquarters of each military department will be limited to the supportive functions of military administration, such as construction and maintenance, and the 650,000 troops of the key military divisions and most of the national defense budget of 6.5 trillion won will be reverted to one person, the national defense chief of the General Staff. Thus, the voice of criticism is rising high.

In connection with this, the Ministry of National Defense said that in order to preserve and develop the tradition of the three military departments it is "currently in the process of developing detailed regulations for the implementation of the reorganization plan, including direct presidential orders. For example, we plan to raise the ratio of the personnel in the National Defense Headquarters of the General Staff to 2 to 1 to 1

for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, rather than keeping the ratio according to the full strength of each department, and will hire two deputies from the Navy and Air Force to assist the national defense chief of the General Staff, the three of whom will form the office of the command, so that the individual concerns of the Navy and Air Force can be reflected to the maximum extent in the process of key policy development and decisionmaking."

The general public and the political circle, which does not relate the military reorganization plan with the government party's political reorganization plan, acknowledge the necessity for a consolidated war power, but still demand a "pan-national public hearing" on the military reorganization plan. This is because of the concerns over the possibility of weakening of the civilian control, military experts point out.

Egypt, Syria Seek North Korean Help in Missile Development

Syria Cancels Deal with China

*SK3012232889 Seoul Domestic Service in Korean
2200 GMT 29 Dec 89*

[Report by AP, YONHAP from Tel Aviv]

[Text] Israeli military sources reported that Syria, bowing to U.S. pressure, recently canceled a plan to buy ground-to-ground missiles which it had negotiated with China. Instead, Syria is requesting North Korea to help buy and produce this missile.

Reserve Brigadier General Aharon Levran, who is a well-known Israeli civilian military expert, says that in connection with this, Syria will be interested in North Korean help, if North Korea can improve the range of the Scud missile and its accuracy. Thus, Levran acknowledged the possibility of cooperation between North Korea and Syria.

In addition, he said it is clear that Egypt asked North Korea's help last year, because its Scud missiles made by Soviet Union were antiquated.

He also cited a news report hinting at North Korea's helping Iran to develop surface-to-surface missiles and to train Iranian air force pilots as evidence of North Korea's assistance to Syria and Egypt in developing weapons [as heard].

Soviet Scud Missiles Antiquated

*SK3012014389 Seoul THE KOREA TIMES
in English 30 Dec 89 p 4*

[Text] Tel Aviv (AP)—Syria is believed to be seeking North Korea's help in acquiring new surface-to-surface missiles after U.S. pressure was brought to bear on China to cancel a reported deal, Israeli military sources said Friday.

The sources also said North Korea and Egypt have begun a project to develop missiles patterned after Soviet-designed Scud missiles.

The revelation by the sources, who briefed a reporter on condition of anonymity, comes at a time of mounting concern in Israel about an intensified missile race in the Middle East.

Fears intensified following Iraq's Dec 7 launching of the Abed, a 48-ton, three-stage ballistic missile that Baghdad claimed was capable of putting satellites into space.

North Korea has a well-developed arms industry, and the Israeli sources said it had supplied Iran with Soviet-designed Scud surface-to-surface missiles during the Persian Gulf War with Iraq.

The military sources said part of the Egyptian-North Korean missile project was being developed in Egypt.

Aharon Levrán, a retired brigadier general who is a leading independent military analyst, said Egypt had an arsenal of aging Scud missiles provided by the Soviet Union and had apparently turned to North Korea last year for help in modernizing them.

"It's not known exactly what sort of help the North Koreans can provide, whether it is just to renew the old Soviet missiles and provide spare parts or maybe install improved components such as guidance," he said.

He also said published reports indicated North Korea was helping Iran develop its own surface-to-surface missile and was training pilots for the Tehran regime.

The Scud-B, which has a range of just 300km and poor accuracy, was introduced into the Middle East in the early 1970s.

Defense Minister Expects North-South Arms Talks

SK0101040090 Seoul THE KOREA HERALD
in English 1 Jan 90 p 3

[Interview with Defense Minister Yi Sang-hun by staff reporter Pak In-chol]

[Text] Defense Minister Yi Sang-hun says he expects arms control talks between the two halves of Korea will begin in the mid-1990s.

In an exclusive interview with THE KOREA HERALD yesterday, the minister said that Korea and the United States are continuing talks to conclude a memorandum of understanding (MOU) on the relocation of the Yongsan U.S. Compound. He thus brushed aside a report that both countries have resolved the knotty problem, with Seoul promising to bear the full cost of the relocation.

Responding to criticism that the excessive discipline in the military torments soldiers, he said the military will set up a committee to investigate beatings.

Following are questions and answers of the interview:

[KOREA HERALD] You did mention briefly the necessity for arms control in a meeting of key military commanders early last month. Would you elaborate?

[Sang-hun] Arms control talks are aimed at staving off an indefinite arms race between the South and the North. Both sides could also promote mutual understanding about the stationing and operation of their armaments in order to reduce the danger of war.

Our effort to achieve peaceful unification of the divided country needs to initiate arms control talks between both sides.

Our basic policy is to control and reduce both sides' armaments in stages after concluding a nonaggression agreement and a peace treaty. But such matters as the serious arms disparity between the South and the North, deep-rooted distrust and ideological differences remain stumbling blocks to arms control talks.

Still, I expect that talks designed to reduce arms between both sides will start in the mid-1990s, considering various circumstances.

By that time, I think, we would be able to make much progress in our self-defense posture and there may be changes in the role of U.S. forces in Korea.

For its part, North Korea is beset by economic difficulties resulting from its continuing arms buildup. The Northern regime, I think, couldn't continue to ignore the democratic reforms sweeping Eastern Europe and may be forced to open itself to the West.

[KOREA HERALD] You said the country will have to make preparations for possible reductions in the U.S. forces in Korea. What do you mean?

[Sang-hun] In my view, the stationing of U.S. troops in Korea has benefited both Korea and the United States. Their presence has been helpful not only in preventing provocations from North Korea, but also in curbing the Soviet expansion in Northeast Asia.

I understand some U.S. lawmakers are demanding a reduction in the 43,000 U.S. troops. Thus far, however, the United States and Korea have not reached any agreement on a reduction in American forces in Korea.

There could be some advantages to the proposed reduction in U.S. forces in Korea, because it would give us an opportunity to speed up the nation's self-defense readiness. But under the current circumstances, where the regional security situation in this part of the world and relations between South and North Korea have not changed at all, I believe the U.S. presence should be continued for the time being.

[KOREA HERALD] You have said you hope there will be improvements in the United Nations Command (UNC) and the Korea-U.S. Combined Forces Command (CFC) in favor of Korea.

[Sang-hun] I hope that the Korean Armed Forces will gradually recover their authority in the CFC. We have already called on the U.S. side to strengthen the power of the CFC's Korean deputy commander and to name a Korean general as its munitions chief as a first step for the purpose. The government will also reinforce functions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff through an overhauling of the Armed Forces Organization Law.

As for the UNC, it is the only legal system to maintain peace on the Korean Peninsula at present, which is still in a semiwar technically.

So I hope the command will continue to exist until peace finally settles on the peninsula. If some changes are needed in the structure of the UNC, I suggest that the Armistice Agreement be revised or supplemented in stages based on an understanding between South and North Korea.

[KOREA HERALD] Gen. Louis C. Menetrey, commander of the U.S. forces in Korea, has said he is willing to negotiate with the Korean Government over a change in America's operational authority over the Korean military at any time, if Korea demands it. When do you think is most appropriate?

[Sang-hun] First of all, I want to stress that the two governments have never had negotiations on the matter to date. And I think it is undesirable to hold any negotiations until either North Korea gives up its scheme to communize the south or our Korean Armed Forces have the capability to cope with an attack from North Korea without the help of the United States.

[KOREA HERALD] When do you believe a memorandum of understanding between Korea and the United States will be concluded on the relocation of the Yonsan U.S. Military Compound?

[Sang-hun] At present, both governments are negotiating to conclude the issue. But the two countries have yet to reach an agreement on costs to relocate the U.S. Military Compound. The government is studying all possible ways to minimize the cost.

[KOREA HERALD] Don't you think that the possibility of military conflicts on the Korean Peninsula has decreased because of the establishment of consular relations between Korea and the Soviet Union?

[Sang-hun] Korea and the Soviet Union agreed on the establishment of the consular relationship last Dec. 8 and officially will start their business from today. It surely will contribute to setting up official diplomatic relations between the two countries and this development will be very helpful in bringing peace to the Korean Peninsula in the future.

But the Soviet Union had opposed establishing diplomatic relations with Korea, apparently because of its relations with North Korea. So I want to say at this time that the consular relations will only contribute to strengthening economic exchanges between the two countries.

[KOREA HERALD] You also instructed key military leaders to prevent accidents at military camps, particularly beatings. Could you talk about ideal ways to head off deaths of soldiers?

[Sang-hun] I think tragic accidents are caused mainly by a sudden change in young men's sense of values. Some experience trouble in adjusting to the military because of their psychological insecurity.

The service span of 30 months, I think, is very short to correct their distorted way of thinking, because the spent more than 20 years in society under totally different conditions. In that respect, I have instructed military leaders to educate their men incessantly to prevent accidents stemming from excessive discipline.

The ministry will set up a committee to investigate deaths by beatings and will punish the unit commanders involved as well.

TAIWAN

Defense Minister Discusses Arms Purchase

*OW3012103689 Taipei International Service
in English 0200 GMT 24 Dec 89*

[Text] National Defense Minister General Hao Po-Tsun stated on Saturday [23 December] that as to the weapons which the ROC Armed Forces will use in the future, as long as the nation can purchase weapons it desires abroad, there is no need to produce them at home. However, the quality of certain domestically and foreign-made weapons is roughly the same, the Defense Ministry will still give first priority to locally-produced arms. Hao made the remarks at the Legislative Yuan, explaining his ministry's planned purchases of arms in 1990.

Further on Reported French Warship Agreement

Mainland Warns France

*OW3112091789 Taipei Domestic Service in Mandarin
2300 GMT 29 Dec 89*

[From the "National Hookup" program]

[Text] The news report on France's plan to sell 16 warships to the Republic of China has thrown a new shadow over the relations between Paris and Peking. Peking has warned that this arms sale will constitute a direct interference in China's internal affairs.

France Refuses Comment

OW0101123990 Taipei International Service
in English 0200 GMT 31 Dec 89

[Text] The French Government was keeping tight lip on Saturday Taipei time [30 December] on reports from Peking and Taipei that the ROC on Taiwan was negotiating to buy 16 warships from France for \$4.7 billion. The French Foreign Ministry said that it would not comment for the time being on the matter.

According to informed sources in Taipei, the ROC wants to buy 16 FL3000 class frigates, costing about \$300 million each. The report brought criticism from Peking, where a spokesman says such a sale of arms to Taiwan would be an interference in China's internal matter.

The reported military deal will be the biggest ever between the ROC and France and will include sophisticated electronic equipment, such as sonar and radar. If the arms sale is approved, it would provoke a further deterioration in Paris-Peking relations, which have already been eroded this year by France's support for Mainland Chinese prodemocracy activists and also by a visit to France by the Tibetan leader, the Dalai Lama.

Ministry Declines Comment on French Frigate Deal

OW0401164190 Taipei CNA in English
1559 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Taipei, Jan 4 (CNA)—The Republic of China's Defense Ministry declined Thursday to comment on reports that France had authorized the sale of six naval frigates to the nation.

Foreign Minister Lien Chan said his ministry had been informed of the plan to buy French frigates, but he would not go into further detail.

At a Legislative Yuan Defense Committee meeting earlier in the day Legislator Chang Shih-liang asked Defense Minister Hao Pei-tsun about the navy vessel purchase, but Hao declined to reply on grounds of "defense confidentiality."

An AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE report from Paris Wednesday said that France had authorized the sale of six FL-3000 frigates to the ROC and more could be sold at a later date.

The report stresses that the sale concerned only hulls and superstructures and that no weapons systems were involved.

Military sources said the ROC Government had also decided to buy South Korea-built "Perry class" frigates, and purchases of its "Ulsan class" frigates are still being considered.

These foreign-built frigates will be equipped with ROC weapons systems, according to the sources.

Official Says Satellite for 'Peaceful' Purposes

OW0401175790 Taipei CNA in English
1557 GMT 4 Jan 90

[Text] Taipei, Jan 4 (CNA)—The Republic of China's program to develop satellites is purely for research and peaceful purposes, a ranking National Science Council (NSC) official reiterated Thursday.

NSC Vice Chairman Teng Chi-fu noted that the satellite development program is fully open and after its completion, international academic research institutes will be welcome to share in its equipment and experiments in order to benefit all humankind.

Teng was commenting on an October 1989 request for clarification by the American Institute in Taiwan. "From the very beginning, the military-affiliated Chung Shan Institute of Science and Technology had not participated in the program," Teng said.

The ROC may use United States satellite technology but it would be a commercial arrangement and has nothing to do with the military, Teng noted.

He added that the nation plans to develop satellites hoping that it will help upgrade domestic hi-tech industries including mechanical and electric engineering, chemicals, materials, information and aviation.

France Rescinds Offer To Sell Frigates

OW1101113190 Taipei International Service
in English 0200 GMT 11 Jan 90

[Text] France on Wednesday, Taipei time, canceled the planned deal for sale of French frigates to the ROC [Republic of China] after strong protests from Communist China. The plan reported to involve six unarmed vessels worth \$1.3 billion threatened to worsen relations between Paris and Peking, already tense since the crack-down by Communist troops on pro-democracy demonstrators in Peking last June. Peking last week protested to French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas through its ambassador to France, saying the sale would be a direct interference in China's internal affairs. Sources said that France backed down after recognizing that the sale was more delicate than had been initially thought. France is currently negotiating several important deals with Communist China, including the construction of a nuclear power plant and the sale of high-speed trains.

The Lafayette-class frigates were to be used by the ROC for coastal protection.

Meanwhile, a Communications Ministry official here on Wednesday refrained from criticizing France for its change of position on the matter of selling the frigates to the ROC. The official said the ROC is still using proper channels to investigate the situation.

INTRABLOC AFFAIRS

Modrow Meets With Warsaw Pact's Lushev*LD1001221590 East Berlin ADN International
Service in German 2112 GMT 10 Jan 90*

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—Today in Berlin, GDR Prime Minister Hans Modrow and Army General Petr Lushev, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact, discussed military reforms in the GDR and the GDR's contribution as a Warsaw Pact member.

They must together ensure peace and stability in the heart of Europe, based on the principle of adequate defense and equal security for all states, the partners in the talk said. It was in this spirit that the National People's Army, too, had to fulfill its duty as an alliance in accordance with the task laid down in the Constitution for protecting the lives of peaceful citizens from external attack. Modrow also passed on information about the CEMA meeting, which ended today.

Nemeth Says Ryzhkov Agrees on Troop Withdrawal*LD1301120290 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 1130 GMT 13 Jan 90*

[Text] Hungary and the Soviet Union believe that there is no need, from any standpoint, for the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary. Thus, they have agreed that the units in question will be withdrawn as soon as possible. Miklos Nemeth gave the news to two Japanese papers after his talks in Sofia with Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Speaking about CEMA, he said that transforming the organization will take a long time. At the same time, he indicated that Hungary wishes to create a separate group within CEMA with Czechoslovakia and Poland, which are at the same level of development.

CSSR Commentary on Soviet Troop Withdrawal*LD1401225990 Zagreb Domestic Service
in Serbo-Croatian 1800 GMT 14 Jan 90*

[Commentary by Milika Sundic]

[Text] Soviet-Czechoslovak negotiations begin tomorrow [15 January] in Prague on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia. Does this mean that the Warsaw Pact is on the brink of disintegration? Milika Sundic comments further on this:

Negotiations between Prague and Moscow on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia represent the beginning of the end of the Soviet military presence in four countries that are members of the Warsaw Pact. This in fact is a matter related to the process that has been inevitable given the conditions of the destruction of existing regimes in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary and the GDR, and the changes which have above all taken hold in the USSR through perestroika and glasnost. The latter has been decisive for everything that has

happened and is happening in East Europe, and which has had a decisive impact on changing the state of relations in one of the most monolithic military alliances that the world has ever known.

The negotiations in Prague should not be difficult because, as things stand right now, the USSR will respect the wish of the Czechoslovak Government to withdraw its forces within a reasonable period. This will probably also happen when such negotiations begin with Hungary and probably also with Poland, depending on the stances which the governments in Bucharest [as heard] and Warsaw will adopt in connection with this. For the time being the only thing which is uncertain is when and whether this question will be raised by the GDR Government, which is, at the same time, the most delicate problem of the Soviet military presence in East Europe—all the more so since there is for the moment no question of any kind of withdrawal of U.S., UK, and French troops from the FRG, something which, assuming the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the GDR at any time now, should be the basic precondition for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from both parts of a still divided Europe.

True, the problems which Mikhail Gorbachev is encountering in his relations with the member countries of the already frayed Warsaw Pact are far more complex than the problems within the Western military alliance. However, this was the price paid for an erroneous policy and for, we should say, an artificial alliance between the USSR as the most significant factor in the victory over fascism and the countries on which the Stalinist system of rule was literally foisted and which, as a result of a deal between the Allies at the end of World War II, were incorporated into the Soviet zone of influence as satellites, although no significant revolutionary roots were present in these countries. This has all come to an end. The result is that the time has come to lay down absolutely fresh bases of cooperation, not only in the ideological and political spheres, but also in the military and economic field between the Warsaw Pact member countries and Comecon members. There can no longer be any question about cooperation along the party line, because all the Communist Parties in East European countries are facing disintegration or have already disintegrated, as, for instance, in Romania.

In any case, initial statements by some East European governments made at the time of major changes that they will remain faithful to the alliance with the USSR are no longer binding on anyone, and it can be said with what amounts almost to certainty that the USSR is not counting on these promises either. In the final analysis, Mikhail Gorbachev has more pressing business to deal with because, in his own house, he is facing major changes of a kind which the USSR has not experienced in its 71-year history.

So, although no Warsaw Pact member country where Soviet units are stationed is likely to insist on the Soviet troop withdrawal happening overnight, the view we stated at the beginning is quite certain: The time is

imminent when there will not be any Soviet troops in any of the socialist countries. If the West wants to help Mikhail Gorbachev, it should not take advantage of this in any way whatsoever.

Prague Soviet Troop Withdrawal Talks Open 15 Jan

*LD1501142790 Prague Domestic Service in Czech
1400 GMT 15 Jan 90*

[Text] Czechoslovak-Soviet talks on the withdrawal of Soviet military forces from Czechoslovakia opened in Cernin Palace in Prague today. The delegations are led by Evgen Vacek and Ivan Aboymov, deputy foreign ministers of the two countries.

CSSR-USSR Troop Withdrawal Talks Adjourn

*LD1601165790 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak
1600 GMT 16 Jan 90*

[Text] The first round of Czechoslovak-Soviet talks on a Soviet troop withdrawal from our territory has ended in Prague. Preliminary discussion took place on political, military, international legal, financial, and other aspects of this problem. Our delegation submitted a draft of the agreement on the gradual withdrawal of Soviet troops, which contained specific dates and the draft for deciding the status of the troops before their withdrawal.

With regard to the fact that some issues require additional work, the two delegations agreed that the talks will be continued in the first week of February in Moscow, at the earliest. Ivan Aboimov, head of the Soviet delegation, was received today by Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier.

BULGARIA

Bulgarian Daily Denounces U.S. Action in Panama

*AU2812173889 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO
in Bulgarian 22 Dec 89 p 7*

[Article by Sibila Dimova: "Against Laws, Against Moral"]

[Text] The democratic values and norms governing international coexistence cannot be defended with artillery, ground forces, air forces, warships, or tanks. It is impossible to assert that one is acting in the interest of the people, when those people energetically resist your weapons. It is immoral to count only your own casualties and to do this in a war you began to protect the lives and tranquillity of your citizens. Therefore, the U.S. attack against Panama is not only an illegal act; it is an immoral act.

In addition, the development of events refutes the correctness of Washington's policy. Up to this very moment the Panamanian people in fact have demonstrated their support for General Manuel Antonio Noriega, because they are fighting against his pursuers, who have put a

price of \$1 million on his "head," and because of the very fact that the "evil genius" himself cannot be found. He actually held the entire national government in his own hands, actually succeeded in using the Panamanian people's national pride to the advantage of his personal power, and actually declared that his country is "in a state of war" with the United States. However, it also is clear that official Washington could not understand the reasons why the general found support, namely, that the traditional U.S. interference in Panama's internal affairs and its constant striving to subjugate the citizens to its own interests and demands generated more hatred in the hearts of the people than the hatred that a man involved in the drug traffic could ever evoke.

Gen Noriega is hardly the most suitable symbol of resistance against the imperialist dictatorship. Such a symbol, and actually a more beloved one, was General Omar Torrijos, who not only achieved the treaty on the transfer of the canal to Panamanian sovereignty, but also developed in the Panamanian population a taste for true democratic self-government. However, Gen Torrijos died in what was officially declared to be "mysterious circumstances," but, as everyone is convinced, he actually died as a result of CIA interference.

In other words, the current U.S. leadership, even when its motives are pure, cannot obliterate the consequences of a traditionally immoral policy.

The problem applies to the entire issue of U.S.-Latin American relations. Latin American statesmen may disapprove of Noriega's personality, but they disapprove much more of U.S. intervention by force.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Defense Minister on Army's Reorganization

*AU1912212289 Prague RUDE PRAVO
in Czech 16 Dec 89 p 1*

[Report on interview with Colonel General Miroslav Vacek, CSSR minister of national defense, by RUDE PRAVO staff journalist Dalibor Macha in Prague on 15 December: "Shorter Army Service"]

[Text] Prague (Our correspondent)—Significant changes to go into effect in the Czechoslovak People's Army [CSLA] on New Year—especially the shortening of the basic military service, the reduced call-ups of reservists, the abolishment of the CPCZ [Czechoslovak Communist Party] primary organizations, and the elimination of the barriers on the border with Austria and the FRG—were announced by Colonel General Miroslav Vacek, CSSR minister of national defense, at a news conference in Prague on Friday [15 December].

The proposals in greater detail:

—With the aim of assisting in the smooth transition to the functioning of state enterprises [as published], the CSLA command decided to reduce the number of

called-up reservists to military exercises by 90,000 men in 1990. (In 1989, compared with 1988, this reduction was 15,000 reservists.)

- Next year, when Czechoslovakia celebrates the 45th anniversary of the victory over fascism, **military parades in Prague and Bratislava will not be held.** The money thus saved will be spent on improving the environment in some exposed [exponovane] CSLA garrisons.
- After having obtained the premier's nod, the CSSR minister of national defense will submit to the government the proposal to **shorten the basic military service from 24 to 18 months**, effective 2 January 1990. (Thus, the shortening does not apply to soldiers of the basic military service already serving in the Army.) With this, the minister will propose to the premier shortening the basic military service of **graduates of military disciplines at higher institutes of learning (VKVS) to 9 months.** Also connected with this is the reduction of hours at the VKVS by one-third, and a more suitable arrangement of military training in accordance with students' proposals into some sort of blocks.
- In accordance with the abolishment of the constitutional article on the CPCZ's leading role, Minister Vacek decided, effective 2 January 1990, to **abolish the activity of CPCZ organizations at all work sites and in all formations of the CSLA.** At the same time, the structure of the CSLA's political apparatus will also be abolished. The Army will be built without the participation of political parties, movements, and churches.
- In order to strengthen trust and stability in Europe, the CSLA command proposes that the Czechoslovak Government assess the possibility of **removing the barriers along the entire length of the state border with Austria and the FRG.** Our Army, M. Vacek said, does not need them for defense.
- The CSLA command now assesses proposals for **founding a professional soldiers' association**, which would become their special-interest social (but not trade union) organization.
- Within the framework of the preparations for the seminar on military doctrines in Vienna in January 1990, the general continued, we presented the **Czechoslovak public with the draft of the new Czechoslovak doctrine for assessment.**

Answering questions about the **State Defense Council (ROS)**, M. Vacek said that legislative bodies are assessing its future composition. As an example, he said that the federal premier could be the ROS chairman, and members of the two national governments, the minister of foreign affairs, of the interior, of national defense, and the deputy premier-chairman of the State Planning Commission, could be its members.

Asked by RUDE PRAVO about the real defense costs, M. Vacek said he, obviously, knows the sum. Meanwhile,

the ROS charged the minister of foreign affairs with the task of informing the United Nations that we will publish the appropriate military data to conform with its system. The amount of defense expenditures will be fully published at the end of 1990. He immediately rejected the speculative figures published in the West, which he described as exaggerated. At the same time, he noted that providing defense-related expenditure figures is a complex matter (even within the Warsaw Pact framework certain sums in some countries are included in expenditure, in others not).

On the possibility of alternative service he said that it must arise from changes in the Constitution and not from the law on military service. It is, namely, a weighty matter which creates imbalance regarding the duties of young citizens. Those prevented by political or religious conviction can refuse military service, which is still prescribed by the law. In addition to a change in the constitution, it is necessary that the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs steps up its efforts in that respect.

[Editorial note: Prague ZEMEDELSKE NOVINY in Czech on 16 December on page 1 also carries a report on the aforementioned news conference, mentioning that the minister of national defense "also answered a number of questions, among them of our editorial office, concerning the further fate of the military political academy and the political workers in the CSLA. 'Military schools of all-Army nature will, in essence, maintain their character. The existing military political academy will be abolished and in its stead a military-pedagogical faculty with a different teaching orientation will be established. In view of the UN needs, the stress there will be on teaching foreign languages. The number of political workers will be reduced by about one-third. In no case will they hold their present functions, but will be active as a cultural-educational apparatus, which will also be made immediately accessible to persons without party affiliation and members of other political parties. The Main Political Administration and other political administrations will be abolished.'"]

Army, Peace Council View Alternative Service

*LD2112000589 Prague CTK in English
2148 GMT 19 Dec 89*

[Text] Prague, Dec 19 (CTK)—Representatives of the Czechoslovak People's Army, the preparatory committee for the establishment of the Czechoslovak Peace Council as the highest body of the Czechoslovak Peace Movement. The Independent Peace Association, striking university students and church dignitaries discussed here today prospects for substitute civilian service.

Representatives of the preparatory committee for the establishment of the Czechoslovak Peace Council and the Independent Peace Association proposed to the Army delegation that the substitute civilian service last 24 months and in the case of university graduates 15 months.

Requests for substitute civilian service should be presented within one month after the conscription and their justification would be decided by independent commissions set up at the regional national committees. Before starting military service, all young people will be acquainted with the possibility to perform substitute civilian service because of their conscience but those interested will not be better paid than those who would start basic military service.

Representative of the General Staff of the Czechoslovak People's Army, Colonel Milos Vopatek said that before substitute civilian service is introduced it must be laid down in the Czechoslovak Constitution.

Another meeting of representatives of the Czechoslovak People's Army with the Czechoslovak public is due to take place in January and should deal with making conditions in the Czechoslovak People's Army more human.

CSSR Reacts to U.S. 'Intervention' in Panama

Foreign Ministry Issues Statement

LD2212204689 Bratislava Domestic Service
in Slovak 1730 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] In connection with the U.S. intervention in Panama the Federal Foreign Ministry has issued a statement. It stresses that all disputes between states should be resolved solely by political and peaceful means. In the interest of improving international relations the U.S. administration should therefore halt military action and withdraw army units from the territory of Panama.

Students from Latin American countries held a protest meeting in front of the U.S. Embassy in Prague today. They demanded an immediate end to the U.S. intervention in Panama and called on Czechoslovak citizens to join in their protest.

Human Rights Group Voices Concern

LD2412173189 Prague CTK in English 1543 GMT
24 Dec 89

[Text] Prague Dec 24 (CTK)—The Committee of the Czechoslovak Public for Human Rights and Humanitarian Cooperation has voiced concern over the way of the United States of tackling its disputes with General Noriega.

In a statement conveyed to the U.S. Embassy in Czechoslovakia, the committee stressed that "the Czechoslovak people are returning not only to democratic life but also to open friendship with the U.S. people, sealed by the joint struggle against the deadly danger of fascism".

"All the more we are concerned over the way the United States tackles its disputes with General Noriega, which is, in our opinion at variance with international treaties in the sphere of human rights", the statement stressed.

Commentary Condemns Intervention

AU2512112089 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech
21 Dec 89 p 7

[Commentary by Josef Nyvlt, RUDE PRAVO correspondent in Washington, from the "Notes" column: "The U.S. Doctrine"]

[Text] U.S. television companies have their third "show" in 3 days. After the earthquake and the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, the third nonstop telecast: the invasion of Panama. Dozens of military transport planes, dozens of combat helicopters are flying over cameras which are under the protection of the temporarily occupying units. Arrows on a map, just like during a general's staff games, indicate the strikes by special U.S. units against Panamanian cities.

Like President Bush in his television speech, hundreds of journalists assure, and will continue to assure, what a useful and necessary political step it was, how it was necessary to give a lesson to one dictator who did not heed U.S. warnings and interests.

But what is involved is neither the very controversial person of General Noriega nor sympathies or antipathies for one politician. What is involved is a military intervention, another aggression by a big power against a small country, assertion of big power interests by means of brutal military force, an international act no genuine democracy can agree with.

This is not unexpected. There have been signs for 2 years now. They intensified after the attempted coup on 3 October and after the military intervention by the U.S. Army in the Philippines. However, one expected that—despite growing pressure—President Bush's prudence and the influence of the nascent civilized relations among sovereign states, where Afghanistan and Grenada could have been the last chapters of violence, would prevail.

Where did the U.S. opposition to the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine go? Where are the principles of the Helsinki process? Could it be that they apply only in Europe and to one side only?

The influence of the U.S. perception of democracy on our civilization is indubitable. With full right they condemn the misuse of power, arguments of strength, arrogance, and, at the same time, they unfortunately often commit them. In light of the intervention in Panama, many of the U.S. arguments clearly look, more than anything else, like hypocrisy. What is involved is not just "Bush's doctrine," because before him there also was Reagan and a number of his predecessors. This is the U.S. doctrine with all the paraphernalia.

Army Begins Disarming People's Militia*AU2812100189 Bratislava PRAVDA
in Slovak 23 Dec 89 p 1*

[Text] Prague (CTK)—The announcement by the press spokesman for the CSSR Ministry of National Defense, Colonel Stanislav Pohoral, on the taking over of the People's Militia material: On 22 December 1989, units and facilities of the Czechoslovak People's Army [CSLA] are, in essence, concluding the transportation of the chemical, communications, medical, and other material of the People's Militia units to their stores. As the first things, the equipment [vyzbroj] and ammunition were taken over by 3 December this year. The CSLA will continue taking over material also between the Christmas and New Year holidays. The lack of comprehension on the part of some persons very often prevents a more organized and faster procedure. The material is being assessed from the viewpoint of usability for both the CSLA and social organizations. The public will be informed about the further course and the state of the tasks' fulfillment.

Brno Military Airfield Gradually Phased Out*AU0301092490 Prague RUDE PRAVO
in Czech 29 Dec 89 p 2*

[CTK report: "Less Noise From Brno Airfield"]

[Text] Brno—Karel Urbanek, deputy of the Czech National Council, visited his constituency on Thursday [28 December] and informed the Brno mayor and the representatives of the national committees in the second and the fourth boroughs about the future of the military airfield in Brno-Turany. Because of the high noise level the airfield has become the target of public criticism from about 35 surrounding villages.

The situation now is that according to information of the CSSR Ministry of National Defense, the air traffic on this airfield will be suspended from 10 March until 15 December 1990. During that period the necessary general repairs of the runways, and the repair of signaling equipment for takeoffs and landings will be carried out. The CSSR Ministry of National Defense will expend on this action Kcs146 million and the CSA [Czechoslovak Airlines] about Kcs16 million.

K. Urbanek also provided information on his talks with Colonel General Miroslav Vacek, CSSR minister of national defense. Regarding the future of the Brno-Turany airfield, the minister said that after the general repairs have been concluded one envisages reducing the military traffic at least by half and, depending on developments in the international situation, a further reduction until it will be completely closed down.

Dobrovsky: Soviet Troop Withdrawal in 1990*LD0901193890 Prague Television Service
in Czech 1830 GMT 9 Jan 90*

[Text] Foreign Ministry spokesman Lubos Dobrovsky described changes in our foreign policy as very substantial. If Czechoslovakia wishes to enter the world, and in particular Europe, as a sovereign and completely independent state, it must do so without any specific relations. The specific ties with the Soviet Union must change into relations which are quite normal and based on mutual equality, the press spokesman said.

Speaking about the talks of the Czechoslovak-Soviet commission of experts on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from our territory, he said the following:

[Begin Dobrovsky recording] We expect the Soviet troops to leave Czechoslovakia by the end of 1990. Our point of departure is that the agreement on the temporary deployment of forces on the territory of Czechoslovakia is null and void. Naturally we will not insist in any way that the Soviet side should accept this formulation in a formal, legal way, but we wish to act in essence as if this decision has been adopted. Our standpoint is not based on any, shall we say, compromise position concerning Soviet requirements, but simply on technical possibilities of withdrawing the troops, transport, and so on. [end recording]

In the Foreign Ministry spokesman's opinion, the Vienna disarmament talks and their progress are not essential for solving this question. The Czechoslovak requirements are aimed at renewing normal relations, and these were violated with the entry of the troops in August 1968. Foreign Minister Dienstbier leaves tomorrow for a visit to Poland, and from there he will go directly to Budapest.

Spokesman on Withdrawal of Soviet Troops*LD0901112890 Prague Domestic Service
in Slovak 1100 GMT 9 Jan 90*

[Text] At a press briefing in Prague today, Lubos Dobrovsky, the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman, declared that Soviet troops should leave Czechoslovakia by the end of 1990. He added that we regarded the treaty on the stationing of Soviet troops on our territory as null from the very outset.

Soviet Troop Withdrawal Urged by Party, Populace**Soviet Military Project Halted***LD1401061790 Prague Domestic Service
in Czech 2000 GMT 12 Jan 90*

[Text] Colonel Stanislav Pohoral, the press spokesman of the Ministry of National Defense, has reacted to numerous questions from the inhabitants of Olomouc and its vicinity concerning the deforestation of the

Jedova Hill in the Pohorany area for the purpose of constructing a military installation for the Central Group of Soviet troops. He was empowered to state that the prepared action had been halted as early as June last year, following an agreement with the Soviet side. At the same time, he assured the Czechoslovak public that the agreement was being observed and that the concern raised was unjustified.

Rally Urges Troop Withdrawal

*LD1501022990 Prague CTK in English
2005 GMT 14 Jan 90*

[Text] Prague, January 14 (CTK)—More than 6,000 persons assembled at Pohorany, Olomouc District, North Moravia, today to call for the quickest possible withdrawal of Soviet troops from the district.

The rally organised by the Civic Forums from Dolany, Pohorany and Olomouc culminated in a march to the top of the Jedova Hill. The participants voiced unambiguous protest against the deployment of any foreign troops on Czechoslovak territory and support for the Czechoslovak Government's stand on this issue. The participants proposed free elections or August 21, 1990 as the date of the withdrawal.

In connection with the official announcement that on January 15, 1990 Soviet-Czechoslovak talks on the issue of the Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia, leading representatives of the Party of Democratic Socialism published today a statement expressing their full support for the stand of the Czechoslovak Government which has proposed that the Soviet troops deployed on Czechoslovak territory since August 21, 1968 to withdraw from the country by the end of this year at the latest. [sentence as received]

The Party of Democratic Socialism also called upon the government to appeal to the Soviet Union for publishing the names of the Czechoslovak officials who asked the Soviet Union for military intervention in August 1968, according to a statement of the Soviet foreign minister made last autumn.

Party Supports Stand on Troops

*LD1401201390 Prague Domestic Service
in Slovak 1600 GMT 14 Jan 90*

[Text] The leadership of the Party of Democratic Socialism has issued a stand on the question of the presence of Soviet troops on Czechoslovak territory. It has expressed support for the stand of the Federal Government, which has proposed that the Soviet troops deployed on our territory since 21 August 1968 leave Czechoslovakia by the end of this year at the latest.

It has also put forward a proposal for Czechoslovakia to ask the Soviet Government to publish the names of Czechoslovak officials who asked the Soviet Union for military intervention in August 1968.

The leadership of the Party of Democratic Socialism has also spoken in favor of reducing the basic military service: for soldiers to 12 months, and for graduates who have completed military training as part of their curriculum at colleges to 6 months.

Timetable Proposed for Soviet Troop Withdrawal

*LD1701123490 Prague Domestic Service
in Czech 1200 GMT 17 Jan 90*

[Text] According to Lubos Dubrovsky, spokesman of the federal foreign ministry, the most important result of the first round of Czechoslovak-Soviet talks on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia is the agreement of both sides that the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia is the ultimate aim of the talks. The Czechoslovak delegation set the end of 1990 as a definite date for the withdrawal, while a considerable part of the military forces—that is more than a half—should be withdrawn before the elections.

The spokesman also said that the Soviet delegation has not expressed views on the timetable proposed by us because it has to hold consultations on it.

Lubos Dubrovsky said that the atmosphere at the talks was constructive. He expressed the conviction that both sides would find mutually acceptable solutions as soon as possible. He noted that the Soviet side is willingly supplying the necessary information on the troops. He also confirmed that President Vaclav Havel's visit to the Soviet Union would surely be closely connected with the questions discussed on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from our country.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Committee Endorses Draft Military Doctrine

*LD2012204689 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1602 GMT 20 Dec 89*

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—In the view of the People's Chamber Committee for National Defense, the GDR's future military doctrine must formulate the aim of a demilitarized Europe, questions concerning a security partnership between the GDR and FRG in the framework of the European process, and a strict mission on the part of the Armed Forces to prevent a war. At a session of the committee in Berlin today, the deputies endorsed the essential points of a draft military doctrine that had been prepared by experts of the Defense Ministry, the Foreign Ministry, the Institute for International Relations, and the Institute for International Politics and Economics.

On behalf of the tens of thousands of members who had already enrolled in a future association of professional soldiers of the GDR, which includes army members and reservists, Lieutenant Colonel Dr Eckard Nickel outlined the aims of the association, which is committed to the professional soldiers' political, social, and other

interests and concerns. It saw itself as being independent and nonparty and, in his words, supported—on the basis of the Constitution—professional ethics, active democratic participation in the shaping of service and living conditions, the preservation of the rights of the professional soldiers in leaving active service, and the development of a tradition of committed military-political work.

The deputies welcomed the initiative of the Army members to establish the association, which serves the strengthening of social conditions in the GDR and is an expression of socialist democracy in the armed forces. In this connection the committee also addressed the question of a trade union representation in the People's Police and favored its establishment. The deputies strongly supported the members of the German People's Police who bore a high degree of responsibility in maintaining law and order.

GDR Commentary Condemns U.S. Action in Panama

AU2812184289 East Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in German 21 Dec 89 p 1

[Commentary by Maritta Tkalec: "Invasion of the Librators"]

[Text] The United States is—once again—playing its shameful role of the proverbial bull in the china shop. In contrast to claims and analyses, which can be recorded everywhere—that is, that conflicts should always be resolved peacefully—Washington is attacking Panama, allegedly, once again, to protect the lives of U.S. citizens.

Now U.S. citizens as well as Panamanians are really losing their lives, which were not endangered before. U.S. soldiers are hunting the bogeyman General Noriega, the powerful man of Panama, to bring him to trial in the United States. But for this reason no world power would risk military intervention in a region which is at any rate full of conflicts. Much more is at stake for Washington; strategic positions are at stake: The Panama Canal and the military bases of the Pentagon's Southern Command situated in the Canal Zone are at stake. One has to always be aware of this, in order to avoid becoming enthralled by the pathetic television statements of President Bush, who wants to free Panama, the United States, and the whole world from Noriega. Hardly anyone will still claim that Noriega has a clean slate, but not an insignificant part of Panama's population thinks that he is defending national interests; and this includes consideration for the future sovereignty of the Central American country over the interoceanic waterway.

However, irrespective of the evaluation of Noriega and the potential for conflicts arising over the Panama Canal, the following is valid there and everywhere in the world: Every nation has to decide on its own what way it wants to live in its own territory; and nobody must interfere,

and certainly not with elite battalions, tanks, helicopters, and bombs, as Washington is now doing.

GDR Media Criticizes U.S. Invasion of Panama

Panama Canal Treaty at Issue

AU2912120589 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 22 Dec 89 p 2

[Bernd Graessler editorial: "Only the Pretext Was Missing"]

[Text] The countdown for the intervention had been going on since General Maxwell Thurman took over command of the U.S. Armed Forces Southern Command in the Panama Canal Zone in October. The war psychologist with experience in Vietnam brought about a mental attitude of attack in the Canal Zone, THE MIAMI HERALD reported; 12,000 GI's, who had enjoyed life in a practical holiday paradise so far began to suspect an enemy behind every tree.

The bloody consequence: Excessively nervous U.S. soldiers and Panamanians staged shoot-outs and thus presented Washington at last with the pretext for a military intervention. General Noriega's announcement of "being at war" with the United States last Friday [15 December] was also hardly suited to defuse the situation.

Moreover, it was clear that for months Washington had purposefully moved toward escalating the conflict, the real reasons for which are neither the alleged or actual involvement of the Panamanian Defense Forces and government chief in drug trafficking nor his authoritarian rule in Panama. Much more, the reason is Noriega's persistent refusal to undermine the canal treaties, which General Torrijos obtained with much effort from the United States in 1977. Noriega insists on full sovereignty over the canal and on the dissolution of the U.S. military bases by the year 2000. That is why there have been an economic and financial blockade, putsch attempts, an arrest warrant for Noriega, and the intervention. The United States wants a government that is more inclined toward its wishes, and it has already installed such a government.

The military intervention corresponds with the responsibility for saving the lives of U.S. citizens and to the right of the United States to protect the Panama Canal, the White House stated. The latter is envisaged in the canal treaties only in the event of an external threat, the former is the same dubious argument that was used to justify the occupation of Grenada.

Something else could be conceivable: In the wake of the dramatic events in the Eastern hemisphere, on which the eyes of the world have been focused in these weeks and months, the U.S. Administration has started to put things "a bit in order" in part of the Western hemisphere, that is, in its former "backyard" Latin America. Old way of thinking, new misery.

Further Commentary

AU0201131290 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 29 Dec 89 p 2

[Bernd Graessler editorial: "Noriega and No End"]

[Text] The claim was a grand one, and the name was no less grand: "Operation Just Cause." The enemy, as described by the White House, would have fit every comic strip: a pock-marked, drug smuggling general in an operetta uniform, who subjugates his citizens, collaborates with foreign powers, and wants to deprive the Americans of a big canal, which they need so urgently. The man is General Manuel Noriega, who, according to the Bush administration, had engaged in his evil machinations south of the U.S. borders, before "efficient" U.S. soliders put a stop to his plans. This was an invasion for the purpose of apprehending the bad guy; conviction in one's mission made in the United States.

However, now there are problems: At first no Panamanian wanted or was able to earn the 1 million dollars put on Noriega's head by the White House, and now it is precisely the papal nunciature in Panama City which refuses to extradite Noriega because, regardless of the crimes attributed to him, he was Panama's head of government and was internationally recognized as such.

The fact that the Vatican is bringing something into play which for the United States has not played a role during the entire affair in Panama, namely international law, is an important signal for every observer interested in peace in Central America to stop on the path which might lead to the following: Every state, which has enough people and weapons, attacks other countries in order to capture people whom it previously declared to be bad guys.

For the United States, however, it must be frustrating that it is precisely the Vatican representative who is protecting the "diabolical" general, even if this is done only in order to protect international law against the law of the stronger.

Or is this the solution that Washington secretly expected after the bad guy Noriega had played his role by presenting a pretext for the invasion?

Is Washington's solemn determination to bring Noriega before a U.S. court perhaps already waning?

CBS television already reported that government officials in Washington have strong reservations against a trial of the Panamanian general, because such a trial could reveal some "highly unpleasant" details about Noriega's past links with the CIA—an institution which was once headed by the current U.S. President. According to CBS, a "barter" could soon be expected, which would allow Noriega to remain silent and to go to a country that will grant him asylum.

As one can see, even Washington's conviction in its mission has its limits.

GDR Commentaries Berate U.S. Action in Panama

East Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG Commentary
AU0501184590 East Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG
in German 2 Jan 90 p 2

[Commentary by Bo Adam: "This Is Not What New Thinking Means"]

[Text] For 8 years, U.S. diplomats had been able to refer to the very special characteristics of their President whenever Washington came up with plots that contradicted all international standards—the long-term effect of too many Western and James Bond movies.

Such excuses are no longer applicable because the White House is no longer inhabited by the Hollywood extra Ronald Reagan, but by the more serious-minded George Bush. How can one explain that, at the end of 1989, the United States occupied a country, Panama, and left a bloody trail of 1,500 dead in order to get hold of General Noriega, a politician whom it tried to portray as its arch enemy, and that U.S. troops have besieged the papal nunciature in Panama City, have kidnapped the Cuban ambassador twice, and now they have even assaulted and searched the residence of the Nicaraguan ambassador? Even in World War II the inviolability of diplomatic missions was observed.

So what was going on at the end of 1989—when detente was the rule of the day everywhere—to lead the United States to once again assume the role of the political Neanderthal? It seems to me that the past 8 years have left behind a kind of "Reagan doctrine" in Washington, a doctrine according to which the United States applies the unlimited law of the wild west wherever—from the point of view of power policy and popularity in domestic policy—it seems to be the obvious thing to do. All on-site observers confirm that the current Panama expedition has been fully supported by the majority of the U.S. population. Thus, no eminent U.S. politician dares to seriously criticize this act, even though it clearly infringed even on U.S. laws.

The fact that this latest adventure movie is very popular with the audience at home is intended to be regarded as an excuse. I would say that this makes matters even worse. In case U.S. foreign policy has now ultimately become dependent on manipulation through "television democracy" at home, we—and the rest of the world—must be prepared for anything. Where is this going to end and who should be able to stop it?

After all, it only requires wealthy demagogues, who hammer the image of another arch enemy into the brains of the U.S. people via all channels for a few years, for the Pentagon to be permitted to do whatever it wants.

I think that this is not what was meant by the new thinking. New thinking is aimed at the worldwide conciliation of interests, and not at the subordination of international legal standards to U.S. needs.

East Berlin TV Commentary

*LD0501121290 East Berlin Television Service
in German 1854 GMT 4 Jan 90*

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The United States had made it. Noriega, Panama's commander in chief and, in the final analysis, also head of state and government, finally went where he was wanted to go, namely to the United States. Ten days after his flight, he now turned himself in to the Army. Since all that has taken place at night, the following pictures will take some imagination.

That obviously is the Papal Nunciature in Panama, which Noriega left around 0200 European time to be taken to Florida by U.S. military aircraft—voluntarily, as is pointed out in reports. There may have been various reasons that made him decide that: the long abandoned resistance on the part of his Army, the call for him to give in voiced by tens of thousands around the embassy yesterday, but, most important perhaps, Washington's promise to the Vatican that he would not face capital punishment.

U.S. President Bush has paid tribute to the troops involved. Those who died in the operation, he said, had sacrificed their lives for a noble cause. There is some truth in that. The fight against drug trafficking may well be termed a noble cause. According to the rule of the market, however, it is demand that determines production. It would make much more sense to fight the causes of drug addiction within one's own country. Instead, the United States is more than willing and committed to transfer its fight to other countries, such as Panama, as a transit country as well as to the actual producing countries. Last fall, for instance, and these are library pictures, the U.S. military operated in Columbia, too, to crush the local drug cartel. Cultivation was fought and the fields and the laboratories destroyed; rightfully so, but, at the same time, U.S. border guards and customs officers have turned a blind eye toward the cartel's drug flights to Florida, on which weapons for the Nicaraguan contras were on board on return flights.

The fight is not quite as noble, after all, and Noriega's motives, too, are much more complex. Think of the fact, for example, that he used to be a CIA-paid agent until well into President Bush's term as head of that organization. It has never been revealed why it came to a break. According to Noriega's own statement, his relationship with United States took a drastic turn for the worse when he declined to allow his country's involvement in military action against Nicaragua. And, in at least one respect, Noriega has been a constant source of irritation to the United States. When he was sworn in as head of state in December, he once more referred to Panama's

claim to the canal as the most delicate point in the national relationship with its northern neighbor, knowing full well that it was almost all he had in common with part of his countrymen. The United States, he said, was attempting to undermine the treaties President Carter once signed with Panama. Nonetheless, Panama insisted on its right to entire control of the canal.

Having reached the aim of his operation, President Bush pointed out that it also served to safeguard the canal treaties. Only the future will show what that can be taken to mean. In any case, the U.S. Government considers its mission fulfilled, and the troops, of which a first 144 out of a total of 26,000 have meanwhile been withdrawn, will certainly return home as winners. But in order to hunt just one man, they have bombarded and in some sections vastly destroyed a foreign capital, leaving civilians wounded and a reported 1,500 dead.

The invasion was a step that most blatantly disregards international law and constitutes a crime that is not mitigated just because its perpetrator happens to be the powerful United States.

Defense Minister on Need for Army

*AU0801070190 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 28 Dec 89 p 3*

[Interview with GDR Defense Minister Admiral Theodor Hoffmann by Rainer Funke; date and place not given: "Do We Still Need an Army?"]

[Text] [Funke] In the course of the expanding contractual relations between the two German states our readers ask: Do we still need an army at all?

[Hoffmann] I think that we will need it for quite some time. Every state has the right, even the duty, to preserve its sovereignty and to protect its citizens and its territory against military attacks. Also in line with our international obligations, we will have to ensure the GDR's defense capability in the future to a degree that is sufficient for military protection toward the outside.

There are still different states and different military alliances. The FRG is a member of NATO and a considerable part of the military power of this alliance is concentrated on its territory. These are very modern and very strong tank and mechanized divisions, naval air groups, and naval forces.

As long as both military blocks continue to exist and their existence as well as the balance of power between them is one of the most important factors of European security, we will have to maintain the National People's Army [NVA] as part of the Warsaw Pact at such a scope or reduce it to such a scope which is sufficient for the principle of mutuality and equality.

Both German states bear an extremely great responsibility for the preservation of peace in Central Europe.

They are an important part of the sensitive military-strategic balance on the continent.

Objective dangers to our external security, however, also arise from the possibility that an actually unintentional armed conflict might break out as a result of a failure of technical systems or a wrong assessment of military actions by the other side.

This only shows how urgently necessary it is to come as quickly as possible to agreements in Vienna on further confidence and security building measures as well as on conventional armed forces and their decisive reductions on both sides.

[Funke] How do you assess the Vienna negotiations' prospects?

[Hoffmann] I think it is likely that the goal of concluding a first agreement in 1990 will be achieved. In any case, the GDR is doing what it can to this end.

The decision to reduce our Army by 10,000 men and to cut defense expenditures by 10 percent regardless of agreements in Vienna, is being carried out according to plan. Unfortunately, NATO has not taken similar steps so far. We welcome the statement by FRG Defense Minister Stoltenberg that the peace strength of the Bundeswehr will be reduced from 495,000 to 470,000 men by the mid-1990's if an agreement is achieved in Vienna. However, these are just announcements. Not a single unit of the Bundeswehr or the U.S. Army has been actually disbanded.

On the contrary: Only a few weeks ago the Bundestag adopted a new record armament budget of DM54.2 billion. The opposition protested against this, but it was unsuccessful. Its demand to stop the construction of the "Fighter 90," the most expensive armament project of the Bundeswehr so far, was also rejected. We have to take this into consideration, too.

Who Would Benefit If We Were Defenseless

Thus, it remains our task to contribute to the preservation of peace through sufficient defense readiness in the socialist military coalition. We see our constitutional assignment in protecting the GDR's security against outside dangers—military threats, provocations, or an armed attack.

Our military doctrine rejects any first use of weapons and any use of means of mass destruction. At the same time, the defense readiness of the Armed Forces must be such that we cannot be taken by surprise. If we were to renounce this or lay down our arms unilaterally, scrap them, and make ourselves defenseless, we might risk that some wishes to annex the GDR, to eliminate our state and social order could give rise to efforts to establish a "fourth Reich."

[Funke] What does this mean for the staffs and the troops?

[Hoffmann] The ready-alert systems of air defense and of the other forces as well as the command readiness of the staffs and field headquarters must be kept intact also under the current circumstances, and the troops' necessary training for mastering their weapons must be insured. Otherwise we cannot fulfill our obligations within the socialist military coalition.

In addition, under the current circumstances we have another task we cannot reject. This is the comprehensive help and support that is given by NVA members to the national economy, in the transportation sector, and in the health sector. One can feel great readiness to do this among all NVA members. And I would like to convey to them the thanks and respect of the government and the Army command. I consider this readiness for work a sign of their sense of responsibility toward our population.

However, let us not forget: The Army members who are working in the economy or in the humanitarian area are missing from the troops. This poses higher demands on those who stayed there and who have to fulfill the tasks through greater efforts, because there are fewer people, particularly in such unattractive work as guard duty.

The Military Reform Aims at More Democracy

[Funke] In this case, one certainly feels little—as many soldiers wrote us—social renewal in the Army. What about the military reform in the Armed Forces?

[Hoffmann] Above all, we are trying to integrate the Army even more into society, which is renewing itself. A consistent separation of state and party has already been carried out in the Armed Forces. Given all the particularities of the military sector (order and obedience, principle of individual command by the respective military superiors), it is necessary to enforce democracy and codetermination, social justice and legal security, moral purity, and economic efficiency also in the NVA.

This results in numerous and far-reaching consequences, in particular for the leadership of the Armed Forces, their parliamentary control, the defense budget's publication, the Armed Forces' assignment, life in the barracks, the army members' political and military activity, and the Army's entire public relations work.

All in all, in the future the Army's training and education must be supported by the entire society. Which methods and forms of organization are used to do this must be discovered in joint thinking, discussing, and experimenting.

During these days and weeks various forms of representation of the interests of soldiers, noncommissioned officers, warrant officers and officers are forming as are spokesmen aktivs and soldiers' councils which have the right to be heard and to present proposals. An association of professional soldiers and a reservists' association are on the point of being formed.

In order to outline a second direction of the military reform, we need more modern and efficient structures in the Ministry of National Defense and in the entire Army. A basic separation between ministerial and military tasks, the reduction of command echelons, and cutting back the administrative expenditures are being prepared. This work is being done, above all, by the military reform committee, which was formed by the government and is headed by the defense minister.

A third direction of the military reform is aimed at thoroughly changed conditions of providing personnel for the Army and finding young professional soldiers. This requires a new shaping of all forms of employment and also of civilian employees' status. Military service of 12 months or civilian service of 18 months are being discussed. In general, service—whether as a professional soldier or a temporary soldier, as a soldier in basic military service or as a reservist—for the fatherland and for peace, for safeguarding the state borders, the air-space, and the territorial waters—is to be made more attractive and more interesting.

However, since we have to expect less rather than more financial and material means, it is necessary to shape service, working, and living conditions in and outside the barracks in such a way that they correspond to GDR citizens' demands today and tomorrow and do not contradict our soldiers' demands as much as they did in the past. By the way, some things have already been done and settled in this field. The opportunity to leave the barracks in civilian clothes is an example of this.

In general, we are ready for far-reaching steps toward a modern Army, one that is open to society, willing to carry out reforms, and exercises equity in conscription. The travel regulations, for instance, which we have drawn up for our Army members and civilian employees, are not such a matter of course in other places. We want to act with as much determination and consistency in other areas. In this connection, I am thinking of regulations of service time and leave for our Army members, of enforcing the performance principle, and of similar questions.

A number of changes in everyday military life were introduced by us immediately, some change are on the point of being introduced, and some will take a bit longer. All restrictions concerning receiving Western media have been abolished. Furthermore, we have drastically reduced the number of militarily restricted areas. The Army's medical institutions are made available for use by the local health sector. By April 1990, that is, before the next draft, the law on civilian alternative service, which has been sent for discussion and decision to the People's Chamber is to be passed. The drafts of the new defense law, the military service law, and the border law are being worked on.

[Funke] What about legal security in the Armed Forces and the certainty of the professional soldiers' future?

[Hoffmann] Like any other sector of our society, the Army has a basis of actions—this is the Constitution, the laws, and other legal stipulations. The equality of all Army members and civilian employees before the law, the observation of their rights and their dignity must be secured more clearly by juridical acts, any kind of arbitrariness by military superiors must be eliminated or strictly punished. Military employment must be made binding for both sides. This will include the conclusion of service contracts and an agreed preparation for vocational advanced training after the minimum service period. Pensions for our professional cadres will be set down legally, not only by pension decrees of the Ministry of National Defense. In this connection, too, the legal stipulations are being prepared.

Let me also say that, before they are decided by the People's Chamber, all draft laws will be submitted for public discussion, not only by the Army.

By Far Not All Ceremonies Are 'Trash'

[Funke] Many of our readers' questions refer to military ceremonies. What is your view on this?

[Hoffmann] One can certainly not call all traditions "trash." Some should remain. At the "Unter den Linden" monument we honor the millions of people who fell victim to German fascism and militarism. Or think of the swearing of the oaths at historical sites of antifascist resistance, such as Buchenwald and Sachsenhausen.

However, I am in favor of removing superfluous things. For instance, when I visit a unit to work there and to hold discussions with the Army members, I can gladly do without the honor guard and the orchestra. Parades in Karl-Marx-Allee? We military men have always judged them very soberly and have compared costs and benefits. The NVA did not demand them in order to present itself. They meant weeks of hard military work for thousands of Army members. Such parades should not take place in the future. But I can certainly imagine a field parade at the end of an exercise.

[Funke] A last question: Will you soon have a talk with your counterpart in Bonn?

[Hoffmann] I have been in office for only a few weeks, and, naturally, I have to hold intensive talks with the ministers of those states which belong to our military coalition, the Warsaw Pact. But, of course, I am ready for a meeting with the FRG defense minister at any time.

The agreements made between Premier Modrow and Chancellor Kohl in Dresden make such a meeting not only possible but even necessary. Both heads of government proceeded from the common responsibility of the FRG and the GDR for peace in Europe and advocated a community of treaties between the two states. There is no doubt that this includes the safeguarding of peace, disarmament, and confidence-building in the military area.

There is no doubt that it would benefit the active continuation of the disarmament efforts in Vienna and Geneva and of the CSCE process, which was agreed upon in Dresden, if both sides brief each other and come to an understanding about this also at the level of the defense ministries.

Why should some sort of security partnership, as it was discussed in Dresden for the field of radiation protection and the combating of drug-related crimes and other serious crimes, not also be possible in the field of preventing war, which is no less important for both sides, and in the safeguarding of peace, to which the armies of both German states have pledged their allegiance?

There have already been a great number of meetings between military men of the Bundeswehr and of the NVA here and in the FRG. At international negotiations there are contacts and sometimes cooperation between military experts from both states—also concerning the observation of maneuvers and inspections within the framework of the Stockholm agreements. Thus: We are ready for talks, without any preconditions, and we are also open for ideas from the other side.

HUNGARY

Assembly Authorizes Soviet Withdrawal Stance

*LD0501163390 Budapest MTI in English 1501 GMT
5 Jan 90*

[Text] Budapest, January 5 (MTI)—The Hungarian parliament authorises the Council of Ministers—in conformity with the Vienna force reduction talks—to urge the early withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary at the ongoing discussions with the Soviet Government. The withdrawal should be completed by December 31, 1990, if possible. The government should keep the public informed on the progress of the related discussions, with the diplomatic norms being observed. This draft resolution was formulated at the Friday joint session of the parliament's foreign affairs and defence committees. It remains the task of parliament to pass this resolution.

Another draft resolution passed by the two bodies states that parliament should appoint the president of the Republic to the political consultative body of the Warsaw Treaty Organization as the representative of the Republic of Hungary, and the chairman of the Council of Ministers as his deputy. The representative thus accredited will be in a position to give a statement, sign a contract or amend agreements on behalf of the Republic of Hungary. However, in case an agreement is signed, it will only come into force after enacted by parliament.

Parliament, as the supreme organ of state power, has not yet accredited its representative to the body of the Warsaw Treaty (WT). In most cases, this right was exercised by the first secretary or general secretary of the former Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (HSWP). Members of the Hungarian delegation were appointed by

the HSWP's political committee. This practice—making the right of appointment a monopoly of a single party—has now become unacceptable. The MPs [members of parliament] said. It was also set down at the session that it would be the duty of the representative to appoint members of the Hungarian delegation and the required team of experts to the sessions of the WT's political consultative body.

NATO Delegation Arrives in Budapest

*LD1601222190 Budapest MTI in English 2145 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Budapest, January 16 (MTI)—A 19-member delegation of the North Atlantic Assembly arrived in Budapest on Tuesday at the invitation of the defence and foreign affairs committees of parliament. The delegation, headed by George Bruce, president of the Political Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly, is composed of representatives of the FRG, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Canada and Turkey.

The delegation visited the Ministry of Defence and met brigadier General Jozsef Biro, first deputy chief-of-staff and chief of the operational division of the People's Army. Mr Biro gave briefs on the situation of the Hungarian People's Army, the reforms introduced in the Ministry of defence and the Army, the forthcoming changes, and some topical issues of security policy and confidence-building concerning the Warsaw Treaty.

POLAND

Polish Navy Commander Interviewed on Military

*PM0512141589 Gdansk DZIENNIK BALTYCKI
in Polish 17 Nov 89 p 3*

[Interview with Navy Commander Vice Admiral Piotr Kolodziejczyk by Adam Schmidt—date and place not given]

[Text] [Schmidt] How does such a specialized component of the armed forces as the Navy operate under crisis conditions?

[Kolodziejczyk] Unfortunately the crisis affects all of us. Many people in our country think that there is nothing easier than to reduce the Army or even to eliminate it altogether. But what would be the consequences of such a move? Our national history itself can provide an answer to this question.

The crisis forces us to speed up the process of restructuring the Army, the assumptions of which have been in preparation for several years now. But this process requires time and it must have sensible limits, since the points of departure for an organizational development of the armed forces are always the potential enemy and the potential threat. There is no other way. Otherwise we shall simply become an easy prey for anyone who realizes that we are weak.

The climate in Europe is favorable for our restructuring operations, but we realize that the opposite side—the NATO treaty signatories—does not go beyond declarations and so far has been watching the processes taking place in the East with considerable mistrust. Very few concrete actions have been taken, and as a rule they involve land forces. NATO states are physically dismantling short- and medium-range missiles in Europe, but at the same time there is no reduction in the total potential since, among other things, additional warships are being armed with medium-range missiles. Therefore so far we have not seen a reduction in the nuclear missile potential but merely its “relocation” from land to sea. Consequently, arms agreements are being fulfilled merely in the nominal sense. This is why today any reduction in our modest armed forces presents a complex and delicate problem. We perceive the need to make changes in the structure of the Navy—changes aimed at savings in in the broadest interpretation of the word. This also concerns the question of protecting Poland’s economic interests in the Baltic, that is, setting up a bona fide policing force which would operate in our coastal waters. This would relieve the National Defense Ministry [MON] budget and also, above all else, it would relieve the Navy of having to concern itself with matters which are elsewhere in the world dealt with by coast guard services rather than, as in the case of our country, by the naval forces. These actions would be aimed at protecting our interests in the Baltic in a rational way.

To conclude, here is yet another aspect of the crisis in our country. Unfortunately, it concerns pay problems again. We are not capable of maintaining the appropriate living standard for our Navy personnel. Hence the recent, alarming phenomenon of increasing numbers of our Naval Academy graduates requesting permission to leave the service...

[Schmidt] These days we see changes taking place all over the country. Frequent changes are also becoming a new element of life in the forces. Recently a lot has been said about “humanization” of the military service. What is the meaning of this term, “humanization of life in the forces”?

[Kolodziejczyk] The concept of humanization of military service was not conjured up, so to speak, for lack of anything better to do. It was life itself that suggested certain moves here. In other words, we have witnessed a certain polarization of interests here: On the one hand we have a hard and exacting military service and on the other we have the young people who are being brought up in increasingly comfortable circumstances these days.

Our general intention is to reduce the duration of military training. The acquisition of the required military skills should take a shorter time and the training should be more intensive. That is, the initial training period should be short and vigorous, and the rest of the service should be very relaxed. The men should have free time at their disposal and easy access to leave. If preferred, the time could be spent with the unit, but very much on the

basis of individual choice: It could be devoted to sports, movie- or theater-going, or joining interest groups. In other words, we should provide living conditions almost resembling those in civilian life.

However, at this point we come up against the realities of life under an economic crisis—a crisis which affects the forces to a very large degree. You can provide for time off through an appropriate administrative procedure; it is much more difficult to offer our seamen worthwhile opportunities of spending that free time. What can we provide for these people? We have less than sufficient financial resources.

All the same, the process of humanization is under way and we are aiming to give the young men opportunities for authentic self-realization in the course of their military service. This ties in directly with the forging of good models of human relations within the servicemen’s community, including methods of resolving the conflicts that sometimes occur between the senior and junior groups of conscripts.

[Schmidt] Humanization is not an automatic answer to all problems. One of its direct consequences should be changes in military regulations...

[Kolodziejczyk] The regulations are in effect our military constitution. They will have to be revised and adapted to fit in with the process of humanizing the service. A new version of the regulations is also being prepared. I would like to emphasize the specific nature of this type of service. A seaman has to spend periods of up to a fortnight or so on board his ship when it is at sea and it is, for example, out of the question for him to go on leave during that time. He has to work and be on call on board ship around the clock, as it were. We intend to offer our servicemen compensation for that effort after their ships return to base.

[Schmidt] What about discipline in the force? How does conscious military discipline relate to humanization and to changes in military regulations?

[Kolodziejczyk] The whole question of humanization is also a question of breaking down certain barriers in human awareness. This applies above all to our professional personnel. It is precisely the professional personnel who are afraid that the conscripted seamen will be offered certain rights and privileges for which the professionals will have to pay in additional time and quality of service. It is simply much easier to issue commands than to work at building up a friendly coexistence on board the ship or within the subunit. The latter is something which will have to be learned. This is why the whole process will be spread over a certain period. It is always the most difficult thing to alter the traditional, time-honored outlooks and attitudes. The aim of the new conscious discipline is to make the seaman know exactly what is expected of him at any given time and why. This will always clash with the practice of... well, issuing absurd orders under the so-called military drill.

[Schmidt] There is much talk these days about depoliticizing the forces. What do you think about it?

[Kolodziejczyk] This is a very topical issue and we can expect decisions soon. I have always maintained and I continue to maintain that, in a multiparty system, I would not like to command a unit comprising representatives of different political orientations. The basic function of the party [as published] is to defend the country. This is one fundamental truth. The other fundamental truth is that everybody subscribes to a political orientation of one kind or another. And it will not be possible to issue this simple decree: If you are to serve in the forces, you shall not hold any political views. I think that the eventual solution will be to have no party or other political formations in the forces—which does not mean that the personnel or the servicemen can have no political sympathies or that they will not be able to belong to specific political organizations outside the armed forces.

[Schmidt] These days nobody loves the forces much. On the contrary: Certain mass media show the armed forces in a none too flattering light. In the opinion of many young people service in the armed forces is no longer an "honorable duty"...

[Kolodziejczyk] There are a few fiery orators out there who have only seen the armed forces in cinema newsreels. The issue is not one of politics but politicking. For example, we hear the assertion, broadcast on the radio, that the MON resists the shortening of the term of military service because the 2 years it takes are what it needs to indoctrinate our young men so that they would not, at some later date, hesitate to shoot at their own brothers or fathers. The political apparatus in the armed forces and the classes in political science constitute a favorite bogeyman in the eyes of many of our critics. I can show the handbooks we use in these classes to anyone who would care to look. They contain the rudiments of historical knowledge of Poland and the whole world. We must teach these subjects because we get young men who cannot even find Poland's capital, Warsaw, on the map...

This new attitude to the armed forces and to military service is, in my opinion, a direct consequence of the shortcomings in our educational and instructional system to date, and also of the dictates of the current fashion.

We are all advocates of peace. Who amongst us could possibly dream of war?! But you do not conduct the struggle for peace through disarming the people and making the nation defenseless.

The Polish Navy has just introduced a new system of 2-year service on board its ships. The operation was carried out at enormous expense. Fortunately, so far it has not had an adverse effect on our performance. But I see no possibility of further shortening the length of military service. If, for instance, we were to reduce it to 18 months, the whole of that time would have to be devoted to theoretical training and there would be no

room for on-ship service. The only ultimate solution would be professional armed forces which would be smaller but better qualified. In any case, if we compare a modern warship with one from the last years of World War II, we would instantly see the enormous difference in their capability and potential. In any case, strictly speaking, such modern ships as the Ship of the Polish Republic [ORP] Orzel or the ORP Lublin should be crewed only with qualified engineers.

[Schmidt] Young people today take advantage of the so-called right to refuse military service...

[Kolodziejczyk] The whole issue of the right to refuse military service is both difficult and complex. All citizens must be equal before the law. Some fulfill their civic duty to the Homeland while others shirk it, sometimes under the pretext of grandiose slogans. I personally find all these noisy and ostentatious campaigns highly distasteful and I maintain that there is nothing civic-minded about them. We need detailed legal regulations in this area.

[Schmidt] Thank you for talking to us.

'Soviets Go Home' Slogans, Rallies Reported

AU2112122589 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI
in Polish 18 Dec 89 p 2

[Commentary signed "kar": "Soviets Go Home?"]

[Text] In the streets of several Polish towns, we have recently been witnessing the sight of agitated, noisy groups of young people from "Freedom and Peace," the Confederation for an Independent Poland, and several smaller groups marching about carrying banners and posters, or daubing various kinds of slogans on the walls of buildings and the plinths of monuments. There are a variety of slogans: long, short, clever, irresponsible, or completely devoid of any sense.

The most frequent slogan is: "Soviets Go Home!" It is a slogan that is shouted by young people who are often still schoolchildren, but also by people who, having passed 18 years of age a long time ago, have the right to vote and thus participate in making decisions on national issues. There are many things for which young people can be forgiven, but full-fledged citizens should be held fully responsible for what they say and do.

There is no need to be a great politician to foresee what consequences implementing the slogan would have. In fact, the Soviet authorities would probably find it convenient to withdraw the costly forces of theirs that are stationed abroad. This might even be true of another of the slogans: "Throw the Tanks Into the Volga."

This would amount to nothing less than the violation of the entire postwar order in Europe, and in the long term it would pose a threat to the stability of existing state borders, including our Western border.

A further slogan that young people shout just as loudly during these events calls for the scrapping of our own Army. Anyone who thinks realistically will not have any trouble perceiving the lack of logic and crass stupidity that marks this kind of reasoning.

In what kind of position would our country find itself if it lacked an adequate defense capability and did not have the support of allies? Current international realities are such that even neutral Sweden prudently takes steps to maintain an appropriate defense capability.

It is worth reminding these hotheads of what Prof Zbigniew Brzezinski, the former U.S. presidential adviser, had to say: "Poland is situated here and not in the West, and this is something that is also of geopolitical significance for the changes that should take place in this region in line with loosening the bonds of the Cold War period. What will emerge here is a political vacuum, while the West will become increasingly united. It would be strange if integration in the West were to be accompanied by disintegration in the East, by a return to territorial and ethnic disputes."

Although it may be difficult to accept, let us assume that young people, even adult young people, have a right not to understand something, even if it is obvious, but where are the adults who should provide an explanation?

Poland Reacts to U.S. Invasion of Panama

U.S. Action Condemned

AU2812095989 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 21 Dec 89 p 2

["jem"-signed commentary: "U.S. B-52's Bomb Panama"]

[Text] One could sense that it would get "hot" in Panama before the end of the winter. However, hardly anyone suspected that the United States would go so far as to send B-52 "Super Fortresses" to bomb the capital of the small Latin American country, which could not in any way endanger the superpower's security. It was known for some time that there was a "thorn" in United States' side in Panama. That thorn was and is Panamanian General Manuel Antonio Noriega, who not only failed to yield to pressure from Washington, but resisted such pressure more and more effectively. The fact that President Bush ordered U.S. troops (there are about 10,000 of them stationed in the Canal Zone) to take action aimed at removing Noriega is unprecedented. So, the "state of war" with the United States that the Panamanian National Assembly declared 5 days ago has now become reality, having originally existed only on paper.

What sparked this was probably the killing of a U.S. citizen, who was one of several people who were found by Panamanian troops near a Panamanian military base. Although there was no full explanation of whether this was just a coincidence or a case of deliberate action on

the part of both the Panamanians and the Americans, immediate counteraction was taken. Was not this action rather too rash? I have deliberately avoided the question of Noriega's links with the narcotics mafia, because there has still been no conclusive proof of such links, but, even if there were, it does not sanction sending out bombers over the capital of a sovereign state.

The United States has some experience of operations of this kind: The U.S. bomber raid on Libya took place not that long ago. After that attack, the papers said that the damage it had caused U.S. prestige in the world outweighed the benefits that it brought the U.S. Government. There is surely little doubt about how one should view this latest military operation against Panama, whose Armed Forces are outnumbered by U.S. troops in the three bases in the Panama Canal Zone. What is more, times have changed so much that every use of military means to resolve political issues or disputes of this kind must elicit revulsion and condemnation, especially when the blood of innocent civilians is shed. Fifty people have been killed in Panama so far. One would like to say that this is not in keeping with the spirit of the times and that these methods belong to the past. However, some lessons are only learned with great difficulty and reluctance.

U.S. Invasion 'Unjustifiable'

AU2812181289 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 21 Dec 89 p 5

[Commentary by Zymunt Slomkowski: "No Justification"]

[Text] This intervention had been in the offing for a long time. On 3 October, there was an attempt to topple General Noriega, and, when the U.S. forces stationed on U.S. bases along the Panama Canal failed to support the insurgents, many voices were heard in the United States expressing disapproval and criticism for President Bush's passivity. The Senate later was preoccupied with the matter of finding details about CIA activities targeting foreign figures. Then we had the incidents in Panama involving U.S. officers.

It now appears that these were only preliminary maneuvers to mold public opinion and to prepare it for the real operation.

The conflicting opinions and information about Gen Noriega and the accusations leveled against him—even if they prove to be substantiated—cannot, however, justify Wednesday's aggression. The indisputable fact is that the U.S.-Panamanian conflict has in essence nothing to do with Gen Noriega. The Panama Canal is the issue at stake here. According to a treaty signed in 1977 during the Carter presidency, the Panama Canal is to pass to Panamanian control in the year 2000. However, in Washington the matter was later reviewed and it was decided to revise the treaty. The real issue lies in the fact that Panama should remain under the control of the United States, which treats all of Central America as its own territory where nobody has the right to disagree. It

is Gen Noriega—once supported by the United States—who thought differently. His opinion was seen as even more dangerous because it was expressed against a scenario that has been formed in Nicaragua and San Salvador.

The United States never accepted the "Brezhnev Doctrine." On the contrary, it was one of its most vehement critics. In practice, however, it makes use of this doctrine and has been doing so for some time in its own sphere of influence, that is to say, in the sphere of vital U.S. interests, as it tends to be called.

The armed attack on a sovereign state—independent of the propaganda motivation behind it—is a foreign intervention, an armed intervention in the internal affairs of another country—just like Grenada was a few years ago.

It is possible that Noriega deserves to be condemned. Can this, however, justify an armed intervention? This is a dangerous precedent and all the more so because, in this case, the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury are one and the same, namely, the U.S. Government.

Wednesday's aggression must arouse deep anxiety, because it has occurred at a time when the world is striving for dialogue, peaceful understanding, and striving to extinguish regional conflicts by political means. The Panama operation is a blow to these endeavors, and, moreover, it plays into the hands of all those who would still prefer to resort to force and who want to sabotage peaceful solutions.

Anti-Soviet Demonstration Held in Legnica

*LD1201230890 Warsaw Domestic Service
in Polish 2200 GMT 12 Jan 90*

[Tatiana Zychlinska dispatch from Legnica]

[Text] The Freedom and Peace Movement [FPM] organized a demonstration in Legnica today against the stationing of Soviet troops in Poland. A letter concerning this matter and addressed to Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki on 15 November of last year and another letter, in which FPM members express concern with, I quote—the total lack of interest of the premier with the stationing of Soviet troops on Polish territory, end of quote—were read in front of the Monument to Brotherhood in Arms and later in front of the commander's headquarters of the Soviet garrison in Legnica. Doubts were also expressed about the correctness of the settling of accounts between the Soviet Army and Poland. About 200 people who took part in the demonstration went home peacefully after the demonstration ended.

At that point a conversation took place between a FPM representative and members of the garrison command. This was the first conversation of such nature. It lasted for more than an hour. Representing the Soviet side were the garrison commander, the political officer, and an officer responsible for housing and administrative matters, who showed to the FPM representative one of the

agreements with a Polish construction company which is refurbishing an apartment block used by the Russians, as an example of the way in which the accounts are settled between the Polish and the Soviet side. The Soviet side suggested that they should explain all doubts concerning the way all the accounts are settled and give the FPM access to the documents in their possession. It was agreed that the talks will be continued.

Warsaw Radio on Armed Forces Reductions

*LD1501221990 Warsaw Domestic Service
in Polish 2107 GMT 15 Jan 90*

[Report on Armed Forces reductions presented on the "Discussions After The Roll Call" program hosted by Zbigniew Bednarski on 15 January]

[Excerpts] Good evening ladies and gentlemen, this is Zbigniew Bednarski speaking. In today's edition of "Discussions After The Roll Call," I would like to share with you my comments about armed forces reductions in Poland. Restructuring and reduction went quite efficiently and speedily last year. It looks as though in this year too there will be a further decrease in units, equipment and personnel of the armed forces. Following the reductions so far, as of 1 January 1990 our Army had 206,600 soldiers, the Air Defense Forces had 48,200, Air Force 38,000 and the Navy had 21,200 seamen. Altogether there are 314,000 people serving in our Armed Forces today.

Let us add that of these 108,000 are professionals, and 206,000 are conscripts. And, as we are quoting statistics, here are a few more figures: There are 142 generals and admirals in our forces, 54,200 officers, 29,058 warrant officers and 24,600 NCOs.

The figures quoted show that our Armed Forces personnel have decreased by about 40,000 soldiers. A dozen or so units have been disbanded. Considerable amounts of battle equipment of these units have been destroyed. So far it was mainly the equipment of land forces, such as tanks, APCs, cars or even artillery. Now it is the turn of the Air Force. After all, three Air regiments have been disbanded. Therefore, there was a surplus of aircraft which, in accordance with the decisions of the Committee of National Defense Ministers of the Warsaw Pact, were ordered by our head of Ministry of Defense to be withdrawn.

Today the physical destruction of these aircraft was started. They were gathered at the airfield of the 10th fighter regiment in Lasko. Intensive work has been going on since the morning. I watched it together with Colonel Grzegorz Bajko. [passage omitted]

It is planned by the end of this year to withdraw further 130 training and training and battle aircraft. As from 1995 our Air Force will therefore use only the aircraft of the following type: MIG 29, 23, 21 and 21 BIS, and SU 20 and SU 22. Altogether there will remain 400 battle aircraft, unless there are more reductions caused by

further disarmament decisions. During my stay in Lasko I watched how the aircraft were destroyed. [passage omitted]

ROMANIA

Defense Minister on Strengths of Securitate, Army

*LD2312222789 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 2100 GMT 23 Dec 89*

[Text] We have spoken with Defense Ministry spokesman Gyorgy Keleti, who says that the Securitate has approximately 70,000 soldiers, who are extremely well armed. The Romanian Army has slightly more than 100,000 people. The Ministry spokesman said that in spite of the fact that the Securitate units are holding their ground so well, it appears that the Army might gain the upper hand soon.

King Michael Urges Warsaw Pact Intervention

*AU2312165489 Paris AFP in English
1641 GMT 23 Dec 89*

[Text] Paris, Dec 23 (AFP)—Former King Michael of Romania on Saturday called on Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Warsaw Pact nations to intervene against what he called "foreign aggression" in Romania.

"Foreign troops are fighting the people of my country," the former king said, referring to "elite Syrian and Libyan troops" alleged to be fighting in the strife-torn Eastern European country.

Hungarian radio reported earlier that Syrian and Libyan mercenaries were among those fighting Romanian Army forces which are backing the newly-proclaimed government in the capital Bucharest, where fierce street battles have been raging.

Libya has denied the reports.

Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov said Saturday that Moscow should provide medical and possibly other aid to the pro-democracy insurgents in Romania, but added that the sending of troops was "unacceptable."

The former Romanian monarch, who lives in Switzerland, called on "free nations and their leaders," particularly French President Francois Mitterrand and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, to come to the aid of the Romanian people.

In London, a group of British conservatives said Britain should support former King Michael's return to the Romanian throne as a way to stabilise the situation and unite the nation.

"Once fighting has ceased and the last remains of the old regime have collapsed, the king could become an immediate stabilising factor," said the Conservative Council on Eastern Europe.

"He is one of the few people not associated with the fallen regime who has any experience of governing the country", the council said.

Among the council's members are current Foreign Office Minister William Waldegrave and former foreign secretaries Lord Pym and Lord Carrington.

"The scale of events in Romania and the sheer horror of them now exceed our worst expectations," the council said.

"What is needed is a figurehead to unite a nation torn apart by bloodshed. The restoration of the monarchy is the only way Romania will achieve this," it said.

The former king, who abdicated in December 1947 and left Romania shortly afterwards, said Friday in Geneva that he was ready to return as king "if the people want (him) to come back."

Soviet Embassy Promises Military Help

*AU2312091389 Bucharest Domestic Service
in Romanian 0847 GMT 23 Dec 89*

[Text] We have been informed that the Soviet Embassy has been contacted and has promised us military help.

Anti-Ceausescu Forces Seek Soviet Help

*AU2312094889 Bucharest Domestic Service
in Romanian 0850 GMT 23 Dec 89*

[Text] Here is radio station Bucharest, Romania. We have been informed that, through the embassy of the Soviet Union, help has been requested from the Soviet Embassy, because the terrorists have resorted to the use of helicopters through foreign interventionists.

YUGOSLAVIA

Slovene LC Congress Condemns U.S. in Panama

*LD2412051189 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service
in Serbo-Croatian 2150 GMT 23 Dec 89*

[Text] Ljubljana, 23 Dec (TANJUG)—A statement was adopted at the 11th Congress of the Slovene League of Communists [LC] tonight by which the Slovene Communists support the international condemnation of the United States aggression on the sovereign Republic of Panama.

In our solidarity we support and remain loyal to our principled stand which opposes interference in the internal affairs of others", the statement stresses. [no opening quotation marks as received]

It also states that crushing the sovereignty of a free state constitutes an unacceptable violation of international legal norms and the principles of coexistence in the international community, the ones we in the LC have always advocated.

This should be stressed even more in the case of a move made by those who declare themselves the bearers of high democratic principles and man's freedoms in the world", the statement concludes. [no opening quotation marks as received]

SFRY Media Reacts to U.S. Invasion of Panama

AU3012101489 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian
23-24 Dec 89 p 9

[Article by Vlado Teslic: "Narcotic of Interventions"]

[Excerpts] Perhaps the countries are indeed not divided into the law-governed ones and the others, in keeping with the newly fashionable political jargon, but are divided as we have been used to in the past 4-and-1/2 decades: into big and small, strong and weak countries, the first assuming the "right" of interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

What is the real world like this December 1989? Many people are convinced that this is the end of the cold war that has predominated since the last hot world war, that it is the end of the doctrines on the right of interventions, especially military intervention, the end of theories and the practice of "limited sovereignty" of the countries in the "backyard" of the big powers, that it is a time of dialogue and agreement even between fierce ideological adversaries and competitors for predominance in the world. Perhaps. There are certainly some elements indicating that. At least some international factors behave in this way.

Judging by the U.S. military intervention in Panama, which has many characteristics of unprovoked aggression and which endangers the international climate of negotiations and agreement achieved with such difficulty, this does not apply to one of the two largest military powers in the world, which bear special responsibility for the preservation of peace in the world.

Washington, at least in its own "backyard," does not wish to renounce the practice of military interventions, of military bases, and of spheres of influence, which all together do not originate with the cold war and confrontation with the other superpower or with "communism," as it was maintained for a long time, but have their origin in the years long past, at the end of the last and the beginning of this century.

It is difficult to avoid thinking about possible consequences not only for the Latin American and the Caribbean regions, where small and poor countries are waging a decisive historical battle for independence, emancipation, economic growth, and democratization, and where

such interventions will always generate new strong generals and new revolutions. The consequences could quickly appear in the sensitive soil of U.S.-Soviet relations, which many have believed to be the only catalyst of international detente and of the creation of a new, more democratic, more just world at present. The consequences could also be felt in the field of the yet tenuous processes of gaining freedom, independence, and democracy in East European countries. [passage omitted on West European views on these processes]

Neo-Pacifism

In the other hemisphere, the "Pacific" and Far East, similar events are under way. Old and new hegemonic doctrines are interwoven, and (un)expected military interventions occur to strengthen U.S. strategic positions. The surprise is that the military intervention in Panama occurred before the neo-Pacific doctrine, which has been long in preparation and has not yet been published.

Something was revealed about 10 days ago when two leading White House officials visited Beijing, thus breaking the economic and political isolation of China. That country is too important a strategic partner in the Pacific to remain isolated, it was explained in Washington.

To enter into a discussion about Panama, the way Washington wrote the scenario, is quite unnecessary and beyond any rational comprehension of things, particularly regarding the thesis about America being endangered or about drug business. The most dangerous narcotics are those that act as a stimulant to the policy of interventions.

What is involved is the canal linking the Atlantic and Pacific, which is controlled by the United States, and neither President Carter's successor, Reagan, nor anybody in the U.S. military and political hierarchy has agreed with its transfer to Panama in 2000.

What could stop the Americans from repeating Panama in Nicaragua shortly? Perhaps the Soviet Union could stop them, but not at present under Gorbachev, who proclaimed a new foreign policy of nonintervention even in the immediate vicinity. Certainly Latin America could stop them, but only when united and strong, and it will need a long time to reach that stage.

There remains, like in "the good old times" of cold war and bloc confrontation, the peaceful world public, the voice of the nonaligned, and their moral and political condemnation; and something more, of course: the return of the world affairs, problems, and disputes to the unique world organization that alone guarantees both human rights and democracy.

How moving it was now to hear the speeches in the Security Council or in the OAS, which we have almost forgotten in our hope that the big powers have returned to reason.

EGYPT

Soviet Denies Guarantee to Israel on Syrian Arms*JN2712161289 Cairo AL-WAFD in Arabic
25 Dec 89 p 2*

[Text] Eduard Nalbandyan [name as published], director of information at the Soviet Embassy in Cairo, has asserted that no Soviet agreement or guarantees were given Israel on the suspension of any new deals to ship modern arms to Syria and some other countries. He described reports attributed to U.S. State Department sources and published in a Kuwaiti newspaper concerning these guarantees as a blatant fabrication that deliberately distorts the significance of contacts between the representatives of the USSR and official Israeli figures.

The embassy official stated that the Soviet Union is exerting intensive efforts to promote the settlement of regional conflicts on the basis of mutual interests. He affirmed that despite the absence of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Tel Aviv, the Soviet side believes in the need to conduct practical contacts on various levels with Israel. This is because Israel is one of the parties directly concerned with a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. He added that these contacts are intended to promote a just settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and convince the Israeli Government of the need to adopt a stand that is in line with the realistic and constructive policy of the PLO and Arab countries.

He stated that attempts to attach a different meaning to these Soviet-Israeli contacts will only strengthen the positions of those who do not care about genuine peace in the Middle East.

'Abd-al-Majid on Peace Process, Nuclear Arms*NC2812204289 Cairo MENA in Arabic
1935 GMT 28 Dec 89*

[Excerpt] Alexandria, 28 Dec (MENA)—Dr 'Isamat 'Abd-al-Majid, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, has stressed the need for an Israeli stand similar to the peaceful and positive Palestinian course so that an impetus may be given to the peace process. He said that Egypt is seeking to prepare the right atmosphere for a Palestinian-Israeli dialogue on the substance of a peaceful settlement.

In a speech he delivered tonight during his meeting with Alexandria University staff, Dr 'Abd-al-Majid said that the Palestinian side has recently succeeded in developing its stand in a positive manner. He noted that this stand was reflected in the Palestine National Council resolutions passed in Algiers in November 1988, the peace initiative which Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat proposed from the UN rostrum in Geneva, and the acceptance in principle of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's proposals. He stressed that a lasting peace must be comprehensive and just, and must include all parties,

restore rights to their true owners, and allow all the peoples of the region to enjoy security and stability.

Dr 'Abd-al-Majid went on to say that, on the basis of its overall outlook on peace, Egypt is seeking to keep the Middle East region out of the nuclear arms race. He stressed that Egypt "cannot agree to live with a sword held over its head by any regional party."

At this point he noted the need for all the parties concerned to take the necessary practical and swift measures to implement the proposal to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East, jointly to desist from producing, obtaining, or possessing nuclear weapons or from allowing a third party to deploy nuclear weapons on their territories, and to agree to have all their nuclear facilities subjected to the guarantees of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Dr 'Abd-al-Majid said that Egyptian diplomacy has set itself three main objectives: peace, stability, and development. He stressed that Egypt cannot live in isolation even if it wants to, because of its geographical position and historical role. He added that the achievement of stability in the Middle East requires the attainment of a lasting and just peace that serves the interests of all parties and achieves a balance between them. He noted that Egypt's diplomacy focuses on the country's role as a factor for stability and moderation in the Middle East and on the importance of continuing support for peaceful efforts. He added that Egyptian diplomacy is at the same time pursuing what is termed "development diplomacy" through the constant endeavor to fulfill society's needs for aid, technology, and investments. He stressed that the development process in the country cannot succeed completely if the appropriate international conditions are not present and if advantage is not taken of the available regional resources and opportunities. He called for reviving the North-South dialogue in order to improve world economic conditions and solve the debts problem that is affecting the Third World countries. [passage omitted]

INDIA

Indian-Pakistani Nuclear Facility Pact Ready*BK1301061090 Delhi Domestic Service in English
0435 GMT 13 Jan 90*

[Text] All formalities with regard to the exchange of instruments of ratification of the India-Pakistan agreement on prohibition of attack on each other's nuclear installations has been completed by both the countries. Disclosing this, the Indian High Commission in Islamabad has said that the instruments of ratification will be exchanged at a mutually convenient date as early as possible.

Our Islamabad correspondent, Suresh Chopra, reports that the agreement is subject to ratification and shall come into effect from the date on which the instruments of ratification are exchanged.

PAKISTAN

Pact To Not Attack Nuclear Facilities Delayed

*BK0701092890 Karachi DAWN in English
7 Jan 90 p 1*

[Text] Islamabad, Jan 6 (DAWN)—Although the agreement between Pakistan and India to undertake not to attack each other's nuclear installation is said to have been concluded, its enforcement from Jan 1 this year, the target date fixed in December last year by the two Prime Ministers, has not been possible.

Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto and the then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi had formalised the treaty on prevention of attack on each other's nuclear installation when they had met exclusively about the time the SAARC summit was held in Islamabad. The treaty was to be ratified by the two Governments with exchange of instruments of ratification to become effective from Jan 1.

The exchange of instruments of ratification of the treaty was expected by Jan 1 but for some unspecified reasons this has not happened. Officials here, however, assure that there is no real danger to the exchange of instruments which, they emphasise, would take place soon. The delay that has occurred, it was said, was not for any reason on Pakistan's part. It is surmised that India's new Government under Prime Minister V.P. Singh may have remained preoccupied with some other more pressing State business leading to some slight delay.

SATTAR: Meanwhile, Ambassador Abdul Sattar, accompanied by a Foreign Office Director-General, left Islamabad for Lahore to catch a plane for New Delhi on Sunday. Mr Sattar was called here from Moscow to undertake the mission to the new Indian Government as special envoy of Prime Minister Beqazir Bhutto.

Mr Sattar is expected to deliver a personal communication from Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto to Prime Minister Singh. Officials have not elaborated on Mr Sattar's visit to Delhi but it is supposed to be essentially exploratory in nature to evaluate the possible and likely changes in India's regional policy, particularly on the issues concerning Pakistan which have been under discussion in recent past, such as the redeployment of forces in Siachen area and India's under-construction Wular Barrage which Pakistan holds to be in contravention of the Indus Basin Treaty.

The selection of Mr Sattar to lead the mission to Delhi, which has undergone transition from a Congress-ruled Government to a National Front coalition, supported by both left and right opposition parties, is apparently made in view of his having dealt with the relations with India.

He served as Pakistan's envoy in India for over several years towards the latter part of 1970's and, subsequently, as the Foreign Secretary when a number of issues came up for serious discussion and review in order to normalise relations between the two countries.

Max Kampelman on U.S.-Soviet Relations, Arms Control*18120030A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 46, 19-26 Nov 89 p 6*

[Text] The pace of change in the world today is so rapid and dramatic that we can barely see its details, let alone its scope. And newer scientific and technological developments on the horizon will probably make all previous discoveries dwarf by comparison.

Advanced computers, new materials, new biotechnological processes are altering every phase of our lives, deaths, even reproduction.

These changes in science and technology are producing fundamental changes in our material lives, and in our social and political relationships as well. There is a global trend toward democracy which holds the promise of great forward movement toward freedom and human rights. Almost unnoticed, the numbers of people and the numbers of nations now freely electing their governments or moving with vitality in that direction are greater than ever in the history of the human race. When permitted, and sometimes even when not, people are choosing liberty.

This trend is prompted not only by an abstract love of justice—although this is undoubtedly present—but by the growing realization that democracy works best. Governments and societies everywhere are discovering that keeping up with change requires openness to information, new ideas, and the freedom which enables ingenuity to germinate and flourish.

Free peoples and free markets go together. State-controlled centralized planning cannot keep up with the pace of change. A closed, tightly-controlled society cannot compete in a world experiencing an information explosion that knows no national boundaries.

We are in a time when no society can isolate itself or its people from new ideas and new information anymore than one can escape the winds whose currents affect us all. National boundaries can keep out vaccines, but those boundaries cannot keep out germs or ideas or broadcasts. One essential geo-political consequence of that new reality is that there can be no true security for any one country unless there is security for all. Unilateral security will not come from either withdrawing from the world or attempting national impregnability. Instead, we must learn to accept in each of our countries a mutual responsibility for peoples in all other countries.

In this world of increasing interdependence, the lessons for the United States and the Soviet Union—the most important security relationship in the present era—are evident. We cannot escape from one another. We are bound together in an equation that makes the security of each of us dependent on that of the other. We must learn to live together. Our two countries must come to appreciate that just as the two sides of the human brain, the right and the left, adjust their individual roles within the

body to make a coordinated and functioning whole, so must hemispheres of the body-politic, north and south, east and west, right and left, learn to harmonize their contributions to a whole that is healthy and constructive in the search for lasting peace with liberty.

We are told by Soviet leaders that through the process of internal transformation that is demanded by the new technologies, the time is at hand when the Soviet system comprehends that repressive societies in our day cannot achieve inner stability or true security, that it is in their best interest to permit a humanizing process to take place. Certainly, to strive for national or ideological goals through violence is an abomination in this nuclear age. Soviet security, as well as ours, depends on a willingness to be governed by rules of responsible international behavior.

We hear the Soviet words with hope that the deeds and the reality will indeed follow the rhetoric. There are significant and dramatic changes taking place in the Soviet Union, potentially massive changes. But, as we read in the press daily, Mr. Gorbachev's task is a formidable one. Since early 1985 when he assumed office, the Soviet Union's internal problems have sharpened, with an economy very slow to respond and scarcities continuing to be serious. But there is the beginning of change. We must be open to that change and evaluate its effect with open eyes and an open mind. The words "glasnost" and "perestroika" are being repeated so extensively in the Soviet Union that they may well take on a meaning and dynamism of their own which could become difficult to reverse.

It does not denigrate the vital importance of arms control for me to assert that if arms reductions are to be real and meaningful, they must be accompanied by attention to the serious problems that cause nations to take up arms. Arms are the symptoms of a disease. Let's treat the disease. We must address and are addressing regional aggression and conflict, (where the problems in a number of areas in the world remain serious), bilateral competitive tensions, and, of course, human rights violations. The latter, which undermine the very essence of trust and confidence between nations, have been at the root of much of our historic hostility toward the Soviet system.

Our arms negotiations take place in the context of normalizing and stabilizing our overall relations with the Soviet Union. In 1987, we signed and began to implement the historic INF Treaty, the first agreement totally to eliminate all nuclear weapons with a range of between 300 and 3,000 miles. We are far along toward completing a START treaty designed to reduce by approximately 50 percent those nuclear weapons with a range longer than 3,300 miles. We have made unexpectedly rapid progress in our Vienna negotiations designed drastically to reduce conventional arms. We are on the verge of completing protocols on two nuclear testing agreements. We have yet to overcome the serious verification obstacles in the

way of providing the civilized world some peace of mind about chemical and bacteriological weapons.

Within this atmosphere of change and constructive movement, the prospects for increased trade and other economic contacts between our two countries obviously look up. Our government, it should be noted, here takes a cautious and sober approach, albeit occasionally contradictory. Economic ties cannot be divorced from the totality of our bilateral relations. Since the military power of the Soviet Union still poses a potential military threat to our country, and the evidence of reductions in the Soviet military budget are still meager, we favour the expansion of non-strategic, mutually beneficial trade with the Soviet Union, but insist that national security controls on sensitive items should remain in place.

Let me also here note a further major concern in the economic area. Our objective is to help the Soviet society evolve toward joining us in becoming a responsible member of the international community. Soviet leaders unabashedly acknowledge the failure to date of their system to meet the economic and social needs of their people. Our hope is to encourage the Soviet system to move away from an emphasis on massive military spending and, with us, shift their resources to meet their vital domestic requirements. This means tough choices. But we must understand that this may not happen if Western capitalist countries rush with cheap credits and price concessions. There has already been an increased flow of foreign loans. It is reported that the Soviet external debt has doubled under Mr. Gorbachev. These developments could defer the day of reckoning and permit the system to avoid making the necessary choices.

In his 1975 Nobel Prize speech that he was not permitted to present in person, Academician Andrei Sakharov said:

"I am convinced that international trust, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live."

The United States interacts with the Soviet Union in that context. We have faith in our principles as we intensify our efforts, through our negotiations, to find a basis for understanding, stability, and peace with dignity. To negotiate is risky. It is, in the words of Hubert Humphrey (former US Vice-President—Ed.), something like crossing a river while walking on slippery rocks. The possibility of disaster is on every side, but it is the way—sometimes the only way—to get across.

The US and USSR have begun a historic process. With the complex issues we face, however, coupled with internal political stresses, even with a package of arms reduction agreements—and we are trying—we will still be nearer to the beginning, than to the end of that process.

Commentary on U.S. Forces, Policies in Pacific Area

90UM0178A Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
20 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Commentary by Colonel Yu. Petrov: "The Pentagon's Asian Headquarters"]

[Text] The Asian-Pacific Ocean region has been drawing the attention of American strategists more and more strongly. And this is apparent first of all because of the energetic measures underway in recent years and even months to improve the organizational structure of the U.S. disposition of armed forces in the region of the Pacific Ocean, to increase the combat capabilities of the Navy's troops and forces there, and to give them a greater offensive emphasis.

Today this force numbers more than 500,000 servicemen, 3 Army divisions and 1 separate brigade, one expeditionary division and one brigade of Marines, about 190 tanks, 580 guns and mortars, about 1,000 Navy and Air Force aircraft, and more than 170 fighting ships, including 7 aircraft carriers and about 30 ships equipped with "Tomahawk" cruise missiles.

In Alaska this July a regional U.S. Armed Forces command element was created with operational subordination to the commander in chief of joint forces in this zone. The command is made up of the Army's 6th Light Infantry Division and units and subunits of the U.S. Air Force command element in the zone of Alaska. In all, there are more than 21,000 personnel and about 250 airplanes and helicopters of Air Force and Army combat and auxiliary aviation. Next year the Air Force command element may be reorganized into a new air force. Previously the forces in Alaska were subordinate to the corresponding staffs of the branches of the armed forces and were intended first and foremost for the defense of Alaska. But now they are gathered into a single concentrated attack force.

A command for U.S. Armed Forces special operations in the Pacific Ocean zone is in the process of being constituted. Long-term plans for the new command include the creation in the near future of new land, air, and sea subunits for operations in the Far East and Southeast Asia.

Still one more new command element was created in October: A U.S. Army command in the Pacific Ocean zone. Subordinate to it are two light divisions and one infantry division as well as other Army units and subunits stationed in Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, and South Korea. The personnel of this command number 70,000 servicemen.

The "light" combined units, as can be seen, make up the basis of the U.S. ground forces in the region. Working in coordination with special-purpose troops, they are most

opportune suited, as the Pentagon believes, for conducting various combat operations, and offensive operations in particular, in regions that are isolated and weakly equipped from a strategic standpoint.

After activating the 482d Tactical Fighter Airwing in Northern Japan in 1987 and incorporating aircraft stationed in Alaska into the force, the U.S. Air Force gained the ability to mount an offensive attack in the Pacific Ocean zone, with the use of nuclear weapons, along the territory of the USSR from Chukotka and Kamchatka to the Primorskiy region and Sakhalin Island.

The wide-scale reorganization of the disposition of U.S. armed forces in the Pacific Ocean zone that is being conducted undoubtedly will also entail changes in operational and combat training of the staffs, combined units, and units stationed here. The proof of this is the "Pacex" exercise of the armed forces of the U.S. and its allies, which is unprecedented in its scale, the number of participants, and the range of problems it resolves. Taking part in it were more than 200,000 servicemen, about 600 combat aircraft of the Air Force and Navy, and 200 fighting ships, including 4 carrier forces and 2 assault forces headed by battleships that were equipped with nuclear cruise missiles.

There have not been any war games like it conducted in the Pacific Ocean since the time of the World War II. In the course of this exercise and the "Autumn Forge" NATO maneuvers, which took place at the same time, an attempt was made to verify the ability of the American war machine to conduct a global war using conventional weapons simultaneously in two theaters of war. In the process, one version of the conduct of operations was played out practically in immediate proximity to the national border of the Soviet Union along its entire length from Chukotka to the Primorskiy region.

In this manner the military-political leadership of the United States continues to implement an intensive and comprehensive improvement of its armed forces in the East. And that cannot help but awaken the anxiety and apprehension of the peoples living in the countries of the Asian-Pacific Ocean area.

Soviet Anti-Nuclear Movement To Hold Congress on Eve of Summit

18120028A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 51, 24-31 Dec 89 p 15

[Interview with poet Olzhas Suleimenov, people's deputy of the USSR and first secretary of the board of the Writers Union of Kazakhstan, by Yuri Dmitriyev: "Semipalatinsk-Nevada as Viewed by a People's Deputy of the USSR"]

[Text] The new political thinking born of perestroika is reverberating in other countries. As it echoes back in the Soviet Union, this thinking results in marked changes in

society's mentality. What are these changes? This question is answered by the following interview with people's deputy of the USSR and first secretary of the board of the Writers Union of Kazakhstan, poet Olzhas Suleimenov.

[Moscow News] What is the Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement?

[Suleimenov] The movement sprang up and was formalized early this year. It urges a stop to nuclear tests at Soviet sites; including the one near Semipalatinsk. For too long we have been fighting for peace in the world. It's time to fight for peace here at home. We should start with what is near to us. This is the motto we are trying to carry out. We are trying to awaken the public, especially here in Kazakhstan, with the result that hundreds of thousands of people are now involved in our movement and actions.

One of our major actions came on August 6, outside the Semipalatinsk test site. It was a rally attended by more than 50,000. They paid homage to victims of the first atomic bombings and victims of nuclear tests everywhere around the globe in more than 40 years.

We are going to improve on the forms of our actions. We are now giving up passive forms of protest, sit-down strikes. At best, they are only educational. We propose more active forms of protest. In particular, we are calling an international voters' congress in Alma-Ata next spring. There we plan to call on the most active and powerful force—the voters, rather than governments and parliaments. This is a force that stands above states and classes, which takes in all sections of the population, people of all nationalities and all political creeds. This congress should be held on the eve of the Gorbachev-Bush summit. We would like the congress to come up with the initiative on a complete ban on nuclear weapons, so that this topic is discussed during the summit.

[MN] As far as I understand, you are working for a full and immediate ban on all nuclear tests.

[Suleimenov] Yes. Enough waiting. Enough hot air. This only benefits the military-industrial complex. The existence of military-industrial complexes in the USSR and the US was justified when we faced each other with clenched fists. But now we have debunked the enemy image to see not only enemies around us, or perhaps not enemies at all, but just people who want to live and who are afraid of us.

[MN] Why is the movement spearheaded against nuclear tests?

[Suleimenov] Nuclear tests stand between production and the actual use of weapons. To withdraw the middle link of this chain would mean a sharp cut in production and research in this field.

[MN] In what way does the movement relate to the official authorities?

[Suleimenov] We are the first really popular antinuclear movement in the Soviet Union. And we want to keep this status. To date our funds are made up of donations. We don't have a rouble of government funds. This is natural because we oppose government agencies. For this reason we don't deal directly with the government. But as a matter of future relations, our government, if it really wants peace on earth, should support such movements.

[MN] Is it right that the authorities don't interfere but don't cooperate either?

[Suleimenov] Our state is increasingly very dependent on public opinion. For this reason officials somehow feel shy and don't pressure us much, although we aren't getting broad access to the press. On the other hand, pressured by us, the Supreme Soviet of Kazakhstan has passed a decision on closing the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site. This decision has been sent to the centre. So the ball is in its court.

The country's leaders announced several years ago a unilateral moratorium on tests, but this was a government action. Today the government, pressured by the public, stopped tests for five months this year. Tests were resumed, but now they are again stopped. As a result of our rallies, it has been decided not to carry out any blasts between October 19 and January 1, 1990 near Semipalatinsk. This is because our working people protest. They say: "Each new blast will be responded to by a long strike."

I think our country is strong enough both morally and physically to say: "I've stopped explosions, so you stop too." I see as criminal the nuclear parity theory. It was necessary before: Now it is criminal. This is my strong belief. On this issue we should take the stand of a strong person, a strong side. And we should perhaps yield to the side which is morally weaker.

EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

Defense Doctrine, Balance of Forces Reviewed

90ES0294D Paris LE FIGARO in French
27 Nov 89 p 2

[Article by French Ambassador Francois de Rose]

[Text] Writing 25 years ago under the title "Thinking the Unthinkable," the famous U.S. war theorist and futurologist Herman Kahn published a genuine summa of theoretical conflicts in a nuclear environment.

It is not the unthinkable but the unthought of that is confronting us today as we watch the drastic changes taking place in the East in an environment of perestroika and collapsing Marxist regimes.

The scale of the upheaval is revealed by the fact that the only limits Gorbachev has placed on those changes are that the Warsaw Pact must be retained and frontiers must be respected.

Even if those limits are not exceeded—and it is not yet certain that the popular movements underway will respect them—problems upsetting the view of the future that we have held for 40 years are nonetheless presenting themselves.

The first one, and it is the keystone to all the rest, concerns precisely the future of the Warsaw Pact. The political function of that alliance was to control the regimes in the so-called people's democracies, and its military function was to permit the presence of sizable Soviet forces in the territories of neighboring countries serving as a glacis. Now that the countries involved are rejecting the type of regime in question, the pact, stripped of its ideological substance, becomes an empty shell politically but one which continues to serve the geostrategic interests of the Soviet state.

Apparent Symmetry

And until recently, the leaders in the Kremlin justified their arms programs by the need to protect themselves from Western aggression—even though they enjoyed superiority on a scale of 2.5, 3, or 4 to 1. By now accepting the principle of parity, they are not only giving up the argument that the danger of aggression justifies their gigantic arms buildup both at home and abroad but also removing justification for the presence of 350,000 men in the GDR and 100,000 in the other satellite countries.

In that political vacuum, an arms limitation agreement between the two alliances would give another kind of legitimacy to the presence of Soviet forces in the heart of the continent. But some people are already wondering whether Gorbachev may not have another iron in the fire. By sacrificing the military positions won as a result of the war, he could again bring up the proposal to dissolve both alliances and denuclearize the zone between France's borders and those of the USSR—thus

winning the political victory of seeing an end to the U.S. presence in Europe. Denuclearization would be welcomed by public opinion in many countries, chief among them Germany, and the departure of U.S. and Soviet soldiers would disturb many by its appearance of symmetry.

That symmetry would exist only on the surface, because regardless of the arms limitation agreements, the Soviet Union will remain a military superpower on the same continent with West Europeans, who could not possibly put together forces capable of counterbalancing it. And while Soviet Armed Forces would be pulling back a few hundred kilometers, U.S. forces would be crossing an ocean.

If a proposal to dissolve the two alliances is made, Westerners should be prepared to respond that while the Warsaw Pact has lost its ideological reason for existence, the same is not true in our case because our ideology, far from being in crisis, is the basic element of the solidarity uniting the peoples on both sides of the Atlantic.

Moreover, seeing that such a dissolution would bring us closer to the reunification of Germany, it is more likely that the Soviet Union's interest in maintaining its network of alliances will match, although for different reasons, our interest in maintaining the Atlantic Alliance.

But that convergence guarantees nothing and, as a result, does not free us from the obligation to reexamine our political and military strategies in terms of hypothetical cases very different from those which currently apply both to the Alliance and to France.

Balance of Forces

Whatever situations the future may hold for us, we will have to justify continuation of the Alliance and our defense efforts even though the danger of conflict seems to be growing increasingly remote—unless we believe that the situation in Europe is being settled once and for all by the changes occurring in the East and that what suits us best has become the rule in international relations.

The Alliance must determine to what extent and under what conditions it will be able to retain the nuclear component in Europe, because without that component, deterrence would cover only those countries possessing strategic weapons, leaving the others vulnerable to all kinds of pressure. With France's full participation, it must reexamine its strategy for conventional defense with a view to adapting its capabilities to the new levels and balances of forces if it does not want Soviet superiority to weigh even more heavily as the U.S. presence grows weaker. In anticipation of such a reduction in U.S. forces, it will be necessary to plan facilities for accommodating U.S. reinforcements in the event of a crisis. In that regard, France's geographic location gives it special possibilities and duties.

When it comes to strategic nuclear forces, we probably do not need to change our programs in any way. But our warning doctrine calling for a single strike with our prestrategic weapons corresponds less than ever to a rational concept. It is less acceptable than ever to plan for a warning strike on Poland, Czechoslovakia, or even the GDR using some 100 or 150 missiles whose warheads would represent several hundred Hiroshimas. It is clear that if we ever have to give that warning, it can only be aimed at military targets located in the territory of "the one doing the threatening," to quote the president of the republic, and not at those in third countries.

The time has come, therefore, to think the unthinkable unless we want to be as surprised at the future of security in Europe as we have been just recently on the political level.

Franco-German Combat Helicopter Agreement

90ES0294C Paris LE MONDE in French
1 Dec 89 p 37

[Untitled article by Jacques Isnard]

[Text] France and the FRG have decided to finance development of a combat helicopter that will be used by the Armies of both those countries. In Koblenz on Thursday 30 November, the firms involved in the program—France's Aerospatiale and the FRG's Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm (MBB), which are equal partners in a consortium called Eurocopter—signed an overall development contract worth 1,885 million Deutsche marks (about Fr6,410 million) with the West German Federal Defense Technology and Procurement Agency, which is managing the program on behalf of both states.

This overall development contract marks the actual start on an aeronautical program representing a total French investment of Fr30 billion. From the time the first agreement was reached (in May 1984, with revisions in July 1987) until now, the program has been regularly threatened by budget rules in both countries.

The program covers the production of two different versions based on a single basic, twin-engine model. One version will be an antitank helicopter (called HAC in France and PAH-2 in the FRG) for use by both countries, while the second version will be an escort and fire support helicopter (HAP) for use by France only.

The HAC and PAH-2 helicopters are expected to carry mainly HOT antitank missiles to begin with, followed by new-generation antitank missiles developed by the two partners and Great Britain as well as French Mistral missiles in France's case and U.S. Stinger missiles in the FRG's case. The HAP helicopters, specializing in anti-helicopter operations, are expected to carry a 30-mm cannon, Mistral missiles, and rockets for support of ground troops.

Concern in French Parliament

Depending on the version, this combat helicopter will weigh from 5.4 to 5.8 metric tons and will be able to fly at speeds of from 260 to 280 km per hour at an altitude of 3,000 meters. It will have a range of 800 km without extra fuel tanks.

The FRG plans to order 212 PAH-2 helicopters. The French order is for 140 HAC's and 75 HAP's, to be delivered over a period extending from 1997 to 2008. Five prototypes will be designed, and the first will fly by the end of the first half of 1991.

Two assembly lines for series production will be installed, one in Marignane (Bouches-du-Rhone) by Aerospatiale and the other in Munich by the MBB. Responsibility for the engines has been assigned to Turbomeca in France, the Engine and Turbine Union (MTU) in the FRG, and Rolls Royce in Great Britain.

On several occasions, the French Parliament has expressed concern over the cost of such a program, which is intended mainly to equip the airmobile division stationed in the Nancy region (the Rapid Deployment Force (FAR)).

According to two of the National Assembly's rapporteurs, Jean-Michel Boucheron (Socialist Party, Ille-et-Vilaine) and Francois Fillon (Rally for the Republic, Sarthe), this helicopter will be extremely expensive: its price will very probably come to over Fr100 million per unit.

Eastern Events May Affect Defense Posture

90ES0294B Paris LE MONDE in French
28 Nov 89 p 14

[Untitled article by Jacques Isnard]

[Text] The events in East Europe are taking the French defense establishment by surprise just when it is beginning to change as a result of both the Armed Forces 2000 plan, which will reorganize its forces, and a military planning law that will determine its equipment through 1993. Are those two plans, which are barely off the drawing board and which are supposed to keep the national defense effort just above what is called a "sufficiency" threshold (still a difficult concept to interpret), being rendered obsolete by changes in the situation in Europe? The deputies were scheduled to debate that issue on Monday 27 November during the second reading of the draft 1990-1993 military planning law.

Seeing that a defense structure takes decades to build precisely because the military production cycle is a long one, any thinking aimed at justifying it has a hard time adapting to a threat situation which gives the appearance of changeability. One general says: "It is difficult to imagine a long-term response to such a fluid situation." Today, even the vocabulary used by general staffs has changed. They no longer speak of the Soviet "threat" but

of the Soviet "challenge," noting that, as Francois Mitterrand remarked in his recent interview with the WALL STREET JOURNAL, "the reality is that Soviet military power remains considerable."

Western general staffs take contrasting views of that reality based on information that is fragmentary or difficult to organize into a consistent whole.

One can get an idea of this by looking at what is happening within the Group of Soviet Forces in East Germany (GSFG). It is true that the Soviet 25th and 32d Armored Divisions and an airborne assault brigade have begun pulling back from that territory in accordance with a withdrawal plan announced last year. That plan, which is to be completed within 2 years, also involves Soviet units in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. But those movements are taking place at night on railroad cars covered with tarpaulins, as though the intention were to leave some doubt concerning the exact type and quantity of equipment being withdrawn. And at the same time, Western intelligence services are reporting a reinforcement of Soviet artillery in the GDR, a regrouping of combat helicopters into regiments, and an increase in the number of MiG-29's as a counterpart to the reduction in the number of Soviet strike aircraft stationed in that region.

Warsaw Pact Less Solid

Even farther east, it is noted that construction of the new Tbilisi-type aircraft carriers seems to have slowed. But the deployment of SS-18 and SS-24 missiles, Typhoon-class strategic submarines, and new Blackjack or Bear-H bombers (armed with nuclear cruise missiles) is continuing as before.

In short, it may be changing, but "the Eastern bloc is not going to disappear overnight," observes one staff officer. The Warsaw Pact has indeed been weakened, and no one in the West maintains any longer that it is organized into allied armies ready to launch a rapid and large-scale offensive without warning. With partners that are learning, because of circumstances, to become once again autonomous with respect to each other, the Warsaw Pact is no longer as solid as it was. Jean-Pierre Chevenement explains: "Soviet policy seems to be turning its back on military one-upmanship."

All the same, the French defense minister feels that "the uncertainties will remain over the longer term." After decades of status quo, the East is being shaken by unforeseeable events and completely different situations whose effect in Central Europe may be to create "metastases"—to borrow the expression used by a member of the National Assembly's Defense Committee—which no one is expecting and whose proliferation would probably be uncontrollable. "This means that a race is underway between the construction of West Europe and the disintegration of the Eastern bloc," says one diplomat in the Ministry of Defense who has just returned from Berlin.

From that standpoint, oddly enough, the current situation is helping a French defense system that is in the midst of a reorganization primarily for reasons having to do with sound budget management.

The Armed Forces 2000 plan is leading indirectly to a shrinking of the national military system. It is aimed at enabling the Armed Forces to tighten up their establishments and commands by regrouping units, services, and staffs in cases where their geographic dispersion was working against their operational efficiency. But the consequences in the field are also of interest to the international community. Like Mikhail Gorbachev's promises to reduce Soviet potential in Europe by concentrating it at home, the Armed Forces 2000 plan can be viewed as the first step toward a deliberate lessening of East-West tension with no weakening of either side's security.

Taking its Time

The same applies to the 1990-1993 military planning law. Either as a precaution or because of a premonition, Mitterrand has formally announced that he will consider himself committed to financing only the first 2 years of that 4-year armament plan. The implication is that France must give itself time to see what consequences the "Gorbachev effect" is going to have as far as European security is concerned. We will stick to our slower pace for 2 years—1990 and 1991—to see what happens.

Admittedly, to take a few significant examples, the Army will have to wait until 1995 to get its first armored division equipped with the new Leclerc tank, the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier Charles de Gaulle will be delayed by 2 years, and the Air Force will probably not be able to keep the 450 front-line combat aircraft it feels it must have.

While not disarming unilaterally, France is following the example of countries in both the East and the West which, for lack of money, are reducing their rate of military expenditure by not replacing equipment on a one-for-one basis when they modernize.

But for the moment, the decision has been made to safeguard the basic component of military planning—that is, deterrence, including so far either the some 120 nuclear warheads carried by the prestrategic Hades missile or the some 75 nuclear warheads carried by the airborne ASMP [intermediate-range air-to-surface] missile. Those warheads no doubt constitute the main stumbling block to Europe's collective security, or perhaps, on the contrary, its cornerstone, depending on how things turn out.

All Combinations Possible

To paraphrase Aesop, nuclear panoply is both the worst and the best of things. It will be the worst if possession of such an arsenal helps increase France's isolation from its own allies before its leaders are forced to lay it on the negotiating table at international nuclear disarmament

talks in a Europe quietened down by East-West detente. It will be the best of things if that nuclear arsenal, which is intended to prevent war, serves as the starting point for the building of Community defense in response to the increasingly certain prospect of a withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe.

Far from being a catalogue for "overarmament," which the PCF [French Communist Party] accuses it of being, military planning between now and 1991 leaves the door open to all possible security "combinations" in Europe, whether they are inspired by euphoria or the prevailing pessimism.

In particular, French planning is based on the idea that the less money there is for financing arms programs, the more necessary it will be for Europeans to cooperate. The West Germans, who want to promote their investments in the East, should share such an ambition. The British, who see the Pentagon cutting back on its trans-Atlantic cooperation, might link up with the French again to produce an airborne long-range nuclear missile which—unlike the Hades with its shorter range—would frighten neither the Germans nor the "new" Europeans in the East.

NATO's Woerner on Impact of E. Europe Events

*PM2712115789 Madrid ABC in Spanish
15 Dec 89 pp 38-39*

[Interview with NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner by Juan Vicente Boo in Brussels; date not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Boo] Mr Woerner, the communist parties and governments in East Europe are collapsing. Czechoslovakia now has a cabinet with a noncommunist majority even before calling free elections. Do you believe it possible that the same thing will happen in the GDR before the May elections?

[Woerner] As you can see, events in the GDR are following each other so rapidly that it is impossible for me to predict. We hope and trust that everything will continue to develop peacefully, that we will achieve free elections, and that they will then be able to determine their own future for themselves.

[Boo] But the Alliance is also setting limits. For instance, at the 4 December summit President Bush presented three new conditions for German unification—remaining in NATO and the EC, a gradual process, and respect for the Helsinki Final Act's principles concerning borders.

[Woerner] The allies have promised to work for the restoration of Germany's unity, freedom, and self-determination, and the events in East Europe bring this aim closer. I do not believe that President Bush has laid down what you call "conditions" for German unity. What he is doing, like any other Western statesman, is simply to consider the most appropriate context within

which that unity can be achieved. The EC has just done the same thing at the Strasbourg summit.

[Boo] But the external impression is that both NATO and the EC are trying to "restrain" the "Kohl plan" somewhat.

[Woerner] The federal chancellor made clear in the 10-point plan presented to the Bundestag that unity is being sought within the context of a broad European agreement which would bring about a new order of peace, justice, and self-determination for everyone. Moreover, he emphasized his commitment to the Helsinki Final Act, the Alliance, and European integration. It seems to me that it would be good both for Europe and for the Alliance if all the European nations, including Germany, could exercise the right to determine freely their own future.

[Boo] Although the USSR is falling behind, after starting this race, Mikhail Gorbachev's latest article in PRAVDA emphasizes capitalism's self-improvement and its convergence with communism. Do these seem to you opinions characteristic of a communist?

[Woerner] (guffawing) Well, I do not wish to be more intelligent or more prophetic than he is. He considers himself a Marxist-Leninist, so believe what he says. For the present, he is still trying to maintain the Communist Party's monopoly, which, in the long run, will be accepted neither by the Russian people nor by the rest of the Soviet Union. This indicates that he still believes in what he says. I believe that he means what he says in this respect, too.

[Boo] The NATO summit expressed on 4 December a great desire to help Gorbachev resolve his domestic problems. Are there real prospects of having an influence in that sphere?

[Woerner] I believe we can. This Alliance is interested in the success of his opening up of society. Gorbachev has done a great deal to promote East-West relations, and I approve of this. So we are interested in his success and wish to support the forces of reform.

[Boo] How can NATO help?

[Woerner] We have various ways. The first is, of course, political cooperation of the kind which you have seen at the Malta summit, at other bilateral meetings, or in the CSCE process. Second, we can cooperate in the economic sphere. The third way is arms control, through agreements which would enable him to transfer resources from the military to the civilian sector. So there are many possibilities, but, of course, the main decisions rest with him and with them.

[Boo] Could you specify the extent of political cooperation?

[Woerner] Bear in mind the great restraint which we are showing. We are not trying to exploit the weak or to secure unilateral advantages from the crisis situation in

several countries. It seems to me that we are making it clear that we want a transformation, but a peaceful transformation; a gradual and evolutionary—not revolutionary—process.

[Boo] From the start of the crisis comments mostly in favor of maintaining the Warsaw Pact could be heard here.

[Woerner] They are not just words. We have proved with deeds that at a time of real collapse of communism, the Alliance has tried not to take advantage but to stabilize and to facilitate the process of transformation. Is this not proof of prudence and historic wisdom? What would have happened if we had been in crisis and the Soviet Union in the position which we now enjoy? You can answer those questions yourself.

[Boo] Last week, President Bush put to the allied heads of government here the "real possibility" of a withdrawal of all the Soviet forces deployed in Warsaw Pact countries. If this were achieved, would the U.S. military presence in Europe still make sense?

[Woerner] Bear in mind that there is a fundamental difference in terms of geostrategy. In order to return here, the U.S. forces would have to travel over 6,000 km and cross an ocean, while the Soviet Union does not have that problem. Of course, there is nothing sacrosanct about the numbers of U.S. and Canadian forces, which will undoubtedly be adjusted to the new atmosphere of security in the future.

[Boo] That which the treaty on conventional forces in Europe [CFE] will create?

[Woerner] As you can see, we are trying to achieve agreed reductions for both sides, and some U.S. politicians have mentioned the possibility of future steps following an agreement in Vienna. However, the geostrategic disparity will have to be offset, and that requires a certain number of U.S. troops here; also as a political symbol of Canadian and U.S. commitment to Europe's stability.

[Boo] In any event, the CFE treaty envisages a considerable cutback of the Soviet forces in East Europe. What would be its political consequences?

[Woerner] It would clearly create more equitable relations among the Warsaw Pact members, based on full respect for each member's national sovereignty. And I believe that it would help the forces of reform in the Soviet Union and the other countries. Moreover, it would help transform the Warsaw Pact into an organization which would reflect its members' free will, instead of the dictates of one country or one party. It could even help us create a better security structure for Europe as a whole.

[Boo] How can NATO adjust to those circumstances? What will be its new tasks?

[Woerner] In the first place, to guide the change taking place in the East and, as a result, in the West—to create favorable conditions for reform, promoting democracy, freedom, and self-determination. The second political task is that of providing a platform for harmonizing the Americans' and Europeans' strategy to surmount the division of Europe. Third, NATO should be used to enhance the transatlantic relationship, developing a more balanced association. Its fourth task is to manage the arms control process. So we have a great deal to do.

[Boo] Last month you said that the Alliance should continue for at least 10 years in order to carry out its new tasks. If the pace continues to accelerate, perhaps the 4 years of your term of office will be enough. Could you be the last NATO secretary general?

[Woerner] I am absolutely certain not. This Alliance is indispensable for the foreseeable future. Why? Because there is no other organization which could offer the same degree of stability, security, and transatlantic cooperation.

DENMARK

Danish Navy Accepts First Flex 300 Modular Ship

90EN0153A Copenhagen *BERLINGSKE TIDENDE* in Danish 20 Dec 89 p 9

[Article by Nils Eric Boesgaard: "Flying Fish on the Lookout"]

[Text] The first of the Navy's new Standard Flex 300 modular ships was officially accepted by the Navy yesterday and will be on patrol in Danish waters.

The Navy's new ship, the "Flying Fish" patrol boat was commissioned into service yesterday and will mainly be used for surveillance of Danish waters.

The commissioning ceremony is an old Navy tradition. The chief of the Navy Materiel Command, who is responsible for the ship's construction, hands over the new ship to the inspector general of the Navy, who is the administrative chief of the Navy. He, then, transfers it to the chief of the Navy Operational Command (SOK), who is in charge of all the Navy's daily tasks and wartime assignments, who in turn hands it over to the new ship's captain who gives orders to hoist the command emblem, a masthead pennant, to the ship's mast.

"The Flying Fish" is the first of the Navy's new Standard Flex 300 ships built of fiberglass to enter the service. The idea behind using these ships is that with the help of exchangeable modules, they can be utilized for a number of different tasks, for example, as patrol boats, mine layers, mine sweepers and military units, complete with harpoon missiles and torpedoes. The modular idea was developed by the Navy Materiel Command and has aroused considerable interest abroad, including the interest of the U.S. Navy.

A series of seven Standard Flex ships is now on order at Danyard in Aalborg, but four additional ships are planned for in the current defense compromise, and the Navy hopes to get a total of 16 ships that will replace 22 older ships.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

FRG's Genscher Urges Security Cooperation Measures

90EN0162A Hamburg VIERTELJAHRESSCHRIFT
FUER SICHERHEIT UND FRIEDEN in German Oct
89 pp 132-136

[Article by Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG minister for foreign affairs: "Peace in Europe Through Cooperation"]

[Text] European policy, like relations between East and West, is facing fundamental changes. Europe is in the midst of a break-up and restructuring process. We are providing history with an opportunity to proceed in a rational manner. History is made by human beings. Peace is not a natural condition. Or, as John F. Kennedy put it in his great address on peace at the University of Washington in 1963: "True peace must be the result of many nations and the sum of many actions." And as he continued to say, it must be "dynamic, not static" to be able to "meet the challenge of each new generation."

The countries in the East and the West have made progress toward creating a just and lasting peace for Europe. To an ever-increasing degree, the Europe of the Twelve is becoming the focal point of a pan-European order for peace. Its aura and the fascination it generates as an open and dynamic community of democratic states continue to grow.

The restructuring of Central and Eastern Europe is also an expression of the European spirit. The call for freedom and democracy has its roots in a common European cultural heritage. This revival of the best traditions of the European spirit makes the ideologies and dogmas grow pale by comparison. Tensions and barnacle-like encrustations between East and West that are by now decades old, are being dismantled. The goal of a just and lasting pan-European order rooted in peace is now so close as to be attainable.

The relationship between Western and Eastern neighbors has, as a result, entered a new phase. A change of tide from confrontation to cooperation is now underway. No one can escape it. It opens up an opportunity for us to actively create a peaceful and stable Europe, but it also places us under a moral obligation to do so. We must take advantage of this opportunity.

"Whoever would build anything, needs peace." This is the way the President of the Federal Republic, von

Weizsaecker, formulated it during Secretary General Gorbachev's visit to Bonn last week.

The United States of North America and its allies have, as President Bush put it during his visit to the Federal Republic, "the common vision of a Europe that is less militarized, a Europe in which large armies no longer confront one another on this side and that side of barbed wire and walls."

Foreign Minister Shevardnadze stated that the Iron Curtain that passed through Europe had become "rusty", and that it was beginning to fall apart. What a perspective!

So far, peace and security in Europe have been assured by the deterrent effects of the military capabilities of both alliances. For the foreseeable future, there will be no alternative to a strategy of preventing war that is based upon an appropriate composite of suitable and effective nuclear and conventional forces that will continue to be maintained at current levels, wherever this is necessary.

The support of our strategy for preventing war, which is based on nuclear means, requires nothing so much as a categorical respect of political parameters, a requirement which applies to no other weapons system to the same degree:

1. The necessity of total rational and moral control follows from the apocalyptic nature of nuclear means.
2. Nuclear weapons are exclusively a political means of preventing war that holds a potential aggressor under a nuclear threat that can be escalated, so that no military action, regardless of its nature, justifies the price to be paid for it.
3. The nature and composition of nuclear weapons must be determined exclusively in accordance with the political purpose of preventing war.
4. As crucial as the nuclear element in our strategy of preventing war will remain in the foreseeable future, it follows from the apocalyptic nature of these weapons that basing our position on the strategy of mutually assured destruction can be only the last resort in a series of desperate measures.

The dilemma of this strategy is in the fact that on the one hand, the threat of using nuclear means must be meant in earnest, but that on the other hand, their use could bring with it the destruction of all life on our planet.

The solution of this contradiction requires the efforts of all of us. It is a common task of the future that transcends considerations of sociopolitical systems.

5. The motto "All men are mortal" has been replaced by the motto "Humanity and Nature as a whole can be destroyed!" This quote from Guenther Anders, from his book "The Outmoded Nature of Man," which I used in

my Potsdam speech and have now modified, paraphrases the dimension of responsibility that has rested on humanity's shoulders since the invention of nuclear weapons. This raises the question of who will bear the responsibility for man's survival in the future, and who the blame, if we should go down in nuclear ashes?

It follows from all this that assuring the peace and responsibility for survival in a nuclear age has become a collective task that applies to all of humanity. Lasting and stable peace is possible only if the risks inherent in a security system that places its faith in deterrence are reduced.

The effectiveness of the deterrence presupposes that all those who play a participatory role behave with the utmost degree of rationality and responsibility. It harbors the risk of the destruction of our civilization within itself if this underlying requirement should no longer be met. Military forces alone can thus assure security only with a limited guarantee. They create security that can be revoked. A policy whose aim is to create lasting stability and security, must attempt to broaden the foundations of our security.

Above the net of deterrence by conventional and nuclear means—above the net of last resort, an additional net made up of cooperative structures of security, one that reduces the risks inherent in exclusive reliance on military deterrence, must be spread. This goal is served by the gradual development of cooperative structures between the countries of both alliances. Such cooperative structures will, as it states in the total NATO concept for arms control and disarmament, "increase mutual trust, lessen the dangers of misunderstanding", and, "make the situation in Europe more open, more assessable." In the interest of our common responsibility for our survival, we need irreversible structures of a cooperative security, from which no one can break away without damaging his own interests. Such a cooperative policy of security requires orientation along the following principles:

- Rejection of the desire for superiority and supremacy, paying heed to the security interests of the other side. Security at the expense of others can no longer exist;
- Dismantling tensions and the causes of tension as a prerequisite of political and military stability;
- Holding back, not looking for, unilateral advantages over other countries;
- Dismantling the images of the enemy, opening and democratizing societies, and making human rights a reality in keeping with the Helsinki Accords;
- Constructive dialogue and openness, particularly in the areas of security, disarmament, and arms control;
- Provision for disarmament agreements that dismantle destabilizing military capabilities in an irrevocable way, and for armed forces that provide defensive capabilities at the lowest possible level;

- No offsetting of disarmament in one region by destabilizing armament in another;
- Development of structures within the armed forces that provide no impetus for continued, competitive armament; and
- Effective forms of worldwide crisis management, so that military conflicts are not even permitted to develop.

The most recent successes in this quarter have been the conclusion of the Soviet-American "Agreement on the Prevention of Dangerous Military Activities", and, like similar agreements between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union—the establishment of a "hotline" between Bonn and Moscow. It is no accident that the most important principles of such new political thought, as it relates to security, are set forth in the joint Soviet-German declaration.

In the long term, we are striving to achieve a new type of cooperative security structure. What is at issue is the creation of a defensive dominance on both sides by means of drastic cuts in military potential and by means of restructuring, so that in the face of an assured capacity for self-defense, strategic offensive operations no longer have a chance. On both sides, the structure of the armed forces must be such that the defender has the decisive advantage. At issue are structures of stability in Europe that can even withstand crises, and render the competition of mobilization senseless.

We know this task is not easy. Many questions have to be answered: What must the nature of armed forces be in order to serve these goals? What sort of equipment and organizational structure must they have; how should they be deployed; what sort of logistics and degree of preparedness must they have? What are the criteria by which a defensive deployment of potential among the armed forces can be measured?

It is also necessary to create a broad structure of trust and cooperation between the countries and the alliances that extends well beyond the area of security policy. Only an intensification of the dialogue, so that it covers as many areas as possible, can lead to a disarming of the conflict between the political systems, and to a form of competition that is exclusively peaceful. In this case, new pathways must be found. Isn't it about time to erect an effective communications system to speed up the exchange of information between nations participating in the CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe]? Should we not have regular contacts between the military academies and other military facilities?

Cooperative security policy means security through cooperation and cooperation in security. It is a commandment of enlightened thought in security policy. Peace, we know, is in principle not yet a given if one side can deter the other from an attack. Real, i.e. just and lasting peace, must be more than non-war. It requires a modernization of thought and policy. It is time to bid

farewell to old thought patterns, outmoded images of the enemy, and used-up models of international policy.

They do nothing more than distort our view of the new opportunities for cooperative security, and the opportunities for cooperation that transcend political systems, as well as the opportunities to meet the global challenges of our age through joint efforts.

The countries in the West, as well as those in the East, have taken decisive steps in recent years and months in order to place the security of Europe on a cooperative footing. A broadly-applied arms control process has led to conceptual breakthroughs and substantive successes. The Conference on Confidence Building and Disarmament in Europe negotiations, which were begun in 1984 led to the Stockholm Agreement in 1986. The INF Treaty of 1987 led to agreement on the destruction of an entire class of nuclear weapons. At the Paris Conference on Chemical Weapons of January 1989, 149 nations pledged to strive for the early implementation of a worldwide, verifiable ban on the development, storage, and use of chemical weapons. The Vienna CFE [Conventional Forces in Europe] and CSBM [Confidence and Security Building Measures] negotiations that were begun in March will open a new phase of cooperative safety policy in Europe. For the first time, both alliances were able to agree on a goal: the removal of the capability to launch surprise attacks, or attacks along a broad front.

Our goal must be to create a condition of stability in which neither side can hope to wrest a military success from an attack. This clearly requires that whoever has more must disarm all the more. Armed forces must only meet the needs of self-defense. They must, once and for all, lose their function as a means of intimidation and threat. Violence may no longer be a policy means. The West's proposal at these negotiations, expanded upon by the disarmament initiative of the NATO summit at the end of May, pays tribute to these goals.

Progress to date in the CFE negotiations shows that today both sides are aware of their responsibility for the creation of a more stable Europe. In spite of a few differences in position, such as in the area of regional concepts, in principle unification appears possible. The talks are being conducted in a constructive spirit, and the prospects for substantial results are good. This is true to a similar degree of other confidence- and security-building measures. Both sides have long recognized what great significance is attached to this string of dialogue concerning safety in the East and West. The CSBM negotiations must culminate in a substantive document that will provide additional quality to the formation of military trust. Without the formation of trust and an increase in mutual reliability through a comprehensive exchange of information on structures, equipment, and military activities by armed forces on both sides, the goal of real disarmament and stability in Europe will not be attainable.

These efforts will not be superfluous, even if a low-level military equilibrium is reached and the capacity for a

conventional offensive are dismantled. For only a restructuring of modes of thought can make the dismantling of military capacities irrevocable. The creation of military trust serves this cause.

The West's CSBM package builds upon the Stockholm accords, and it calls for a detailed exchange of information on strength, deployment, and armament of the armed forces. For the first time, the suggestion has been made that prior notification should be given before new primary weapons systems are introduced in Europe. In this way, for the first time, weapons systems would become a topic of security policy dialogue before they are deployed.

The Vienna negotiations should not be limited to reducing weapons stockpiles on both sides and to regulating military activities, limiting them, and rendering them more transparent for the other side. Weapons and armaments are reflections of underlying political and military concepts, strategies, and doctrines, but they are also perceptions of threats and images of the enemy. Only if we make an effort to render the perceptions, motives, interests, and security concepts on both sides more comprehensible can we succeed in better controlling the sources of mistrust and of the arms race. Only then will we be in a position to understand more fully the other side's fears, quite apart from our knowledge of military capabilities. Only then can there be success in achieving a common understanding of the legitimate roles and goals of the armed forces on both sides. Only then can the path be cleared for a more stable regime in Europe, one that is rooted in security. In such a Europe, both in real terms and in the estimation of the other side, whichever one it might be, the armed forces would be capable of a defensive role, but no longer able to launch a strategic offensive.

The countries in NATO and the Warsaw Pact have, in recent years, expressed a willingness to deal with the bilateral problem of military strategies and doctrines within the context of European security negotiations. If arms control negotiations are to be concluded successfully, then, as it states in the Brussels declaration of 1986, a "common understanding of the philosophy, the goals, and the methods must be present."

The defensive character of an alliance is not the result of the fact that a political declaration has been made to preclude attacks. Agreeing not to attack and promising not to deploy one's forces are not, in and of themselves, sufficient guarantee for security and stability. The defensive character of an alliance must be demonstrated through the defensive posture of its underlying strategic and military concept. It must prevail at the level of the deployment of armed forces. The defensive character of a strategy and a military doctrine is determined, to a marked degree, by the scope, the deployment, the structure, the logistics, and the behavior of the armed forces in terms of their preparedness. There must be no discrepancies between the rhetoric of defense policy on the one hand, and the real structures of the armed forces and

the underlying strategic concepts of mobilization on the other. "Policies of security and planning for armed forces" are permitted only, as the German-Soviet declaration states, "to serve to decrease the diminution and the elimination of the danger of war, and to secure peace with fewer weapons."

We expressly welcome the discussion in the Soviet Union that focuses on a defense concept based on rational adequacy, the parity of funds, and the prevention of war. The degree to which military strategy, potential, and military options are modified, will be decisive. Cooperative security will be possible only when each side takes the vital security interests of the other side into account. Security for one side must not mean a lack of security for the other side. What is at issue is "respecting the legitimate security interests of each country, regardless of its size"—thus the formulation of the German-Soviet declaration of June 13, 1989.

The Atlantic Alliance will permit itself to be a sub-topic in this discussion. From its inception, it has made the completely defensive character of its armed forces and the primacy of avoiding war the nucleus of its military strategy. This is just as true of its conventional forces as it is of its nuclear forces. In the Brussels declaration of December 1986, the Alliance once again made it clear that it should be the task of armed forces "to prevent wars and to assure self-defense." They should not be used for intimidation. NATO's total plan for arms control and disarmament clearly states the following on this point: "None of our weapons will ever be used, except for self-defense. The Alliance does not strive toward military superiority, nor will it do so in the future. Its goal has always been the prevention of war, and every form of the exercise of force and intimidation."

The countries of the Western Alliance are ready, without reservation, to discuss the viewpoints and fears of both sides, and to develop a common set of guidelines and criteria by which to measure the defensive deployment of armed forces and strategic concepts.

Giving peace a new quality through common efforts means continuing to improve political conditions for the creation of a new order of peace in Europe. In concrete terms, that means continuing to expand and develop the CSCE process. Stability and security can be guaranteed only by means of a comprehensive interweaving of relationships and interests between states and groups of states on a long-term basis. Progress on one level has a positive effect on cooperation in other areas. Without progress in the various aspects of CSCE, particularly in the area of human rights and basic freedoms, the countries in both alliances would not have reached any agreement on the Vienna negotiations mandate.

Trust means more than verification, security means more than disarmament and arms control, peace is more than preventing war and military equilibrium. A just and lasting peace in Europe requires adhering to the pledges

of the CSCE documents. It means the comprehensive further development of the economic, cultural, and political contacts between all Western and Eastern European countries. Agreeing to a large number of meetings that are a consequence of CSCE also serves this goal. It demands the full realization of human rights. Paying heed to human dignity and self-determination, and the guarantee of freedom and democracy is the condition *sine qua non* for growing together and for overcoming the division of Europe.

We welcome the fact that fewer and fewer governments are acting like "the ugly girl who breaks the mirror, thinking that the mirror is to blame for her appearance," to use a phrase formulated by Vaclav Havel, the great Czech playwright and civil libertarian. We particularly welcome the dismantling of the barriers along the Austro-Hungarian border.

The path to freedom that Europe is taking leads, as President Bush said in his speech in Mainz in May of this year, to a common house in which East and West meet, a democratic house, a "band of free nations."

Immanuel Kant tells us: Peace among peoples and states is not a natural condition. It is exposed to repeated threat. For this reason, peace must be recreated again and again. Creating peace was and remains, in point of fact, the great task set before humanity. Securing peace through cooperative security structures will bring us a peace that is endowed with new qualities. This requires that the peoples' desire for freedom and democracy, which is expressed so clearly these days, will be fulfilled, but this also requires that we recognize the changes in the way people think, that we take advantage of the opportunity that history is offering us, and that we do all we can to assure the fulfillment of the hope that resides in a European order of peace.

At the end of May in Brussels, the Western Alliance agreed to a program of expansion of East-West cooperation and dialogue that was all-encompassing in its scope. Its goal is, as was stated at the summit conference, "to create a new structure of inter-relationships between the countries of East and West, in which differences are replaced by cooperation, trust, and peaceful competition, one in which human rights and political freedoms are fully guaranteed for the benefit of all peoples."

The comprehensive extent of the economic, technological, and cultural cooperation, the exchange, even of training opportunities, and the intermeshing of mutual interests must render the process of relaxing the tension irreversible. We want to create an intermeshing of interests and cooperation in Europe which makes it impossible for any country to stand alone, to break out of this association without doing extreme damage to its own interests. We need mutual dependency, in the positive sense of the word.

This new structure is necessary in order to be able to confront the challenges of a world which has become, to an ever greater degree, an independent community for

survival. This new community of peoples sees itself confronted by new scourges of humanity. Among these are international terrorism and the worldwide drug trade, but so, too, are environmental problems of a global character, namely the pollution of the seas and the atmosphere, the threatening climatic catastrophe.

Military confrontation is not only anachronistic in a world composed of these challenges. It is a primary hindrance to their solution. General Eisenhower recognized this as long ago as April 1953 in his famous farewell address: "Every rifle that is produced, every war ship that glides down the ways, and every rocket is, in the final analysis, tantamount to a theft perpetrated against those whose hunger is not satisfied, and those who are cold, but are not clothed."

Humanistic reason points the way toward cooperation among the peoples and countries, toward a solution of mankind's problems. A dynamic Europe that is developing in various dimensions, a Europe that leaves military confrontation behind it, means a Europe of opportunity, not only for the Europeans, but for the entire world. The German-Soviet Common Declaration of 13 June 1989 points the way toward a Europe that creates a better future for itself and meets the global challenges.

In a world that is still characterized by violence, war, and a lack of freedom, Europe can provide an example for overcoming conflict that will have worldwide implications, an example for responsible and farsighted policies of countries based upon varied forms of social order.

Let us meet this challenge of historic and global responsibility. History does not repeat itself. Historic opportunities can be used only once. Let us work together to use them to create a peace of new quality.

Background to FRG Troop Cuts Analyzed

90EN0147A Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German
15 Dec 89 p 7

[Commentary by Hans Schueler: "Prudence Born of Necessity"]

[Text] Gerhard Stoltenberg must now face the facts—which Manfred Woerner and Rupert Scholz, the defense ministers who preceded him, refused to do. The Bundeswehr is no longer able to maintain its personnel levels; there are not enough draftees to go around. The way Stoltenberg solved the problem is reminiscent of his tenure as finance minister, i.e. he made the best of a bad thing. "Against the background of the anticipated progress in arms control and of changes in the political situation generally," the minister told the Bundestag on 7 December, the FRG can afford to reduce the Bundeswehr's present troop strength of 495,000 men to 470,000 men by the mid-nineties.

The truth of the matter is that the troop cuts are not being made because the Soviet Union is disarming and has already withdrawn some of its armored units from

the satellite countries of the disintegrating Warsaw Pact, but because there will be fewer and fewer men coming of draft age in the years ahead to meet Bundeswehr personnel needs.

Are the low birth rates of the late sixties being used as a veiled concession to bring about the hoped-for success at the Vienna arms control talks in the nineties? Some of it definitely is being used as camouflage. To some extent, the Bundeswehr planners have been making believe since the fall of 1984 when the cabinet decided on their recommendation to set peacetime strength at 495,000 men. Even then there was talk of an "operational minimum" regular army numbering 456,000 men, with which the FRG would have to make do as of 1995. The magic number of 495,000 men was arrived at by adding on greater numbers of reservists taking part in training exercises, plus the "heightened readiness" status of recently discharged soldiers. That magic number was never really asked for by NATO, nor did the Bundeswehr leadership ever provide a detailed breakdown of the figures. How it was arrived at no longer matters; the magic number is now history.

Without a doubt the manpower and budget cuts will have an impact on Bundeswehr combat effectiveness. In the medium term, the number of operational Army brigades will decline; the Navy will have to make do without a number of its smaller combat craft; the Air Force will be forced to disband some of its flight formations. Stoltenberg has also announced two voluntary cuts. Although virtually assured, they are contingent on success at the Vienna negotiations, i.e. the extension of basic military service from 15 to 18 months originally slated to take effect in 1989 but later postponed until 1992 will be dropped altogether at that time. In other words, conscripts will continue to perform 15 months of basic military service. This will inevitably reduce the number of regular Army members (i.e. conscripts, professional soldiers, and long-term servicemen) to 400,000 men or less. By admitting that these are the real facts of life, the Defense Ministry has in effect dropped its insistence on the "operational minimum" principle.

Officially, the Vienna talks are solely concerned with the number of Soviet and American troops stationed in the countries of the two pact systems. In both instances, the number of men is to be fixed at 275,000. This means that the Soviets would have to withdraw some 300,000 men from the Warsaw Pact countries and the Americans would withdraw 30,000 men, primarily from the FRG (commensurate with present troop strengths of 575,000 and 305,000 men respectively).

Up to now, Soviet military men have been unwilling to agree to this formula for understandable reasons. They point out that there are 160,000 more troops stationed in the FRG in addition to the U.S. forces and the Bundeswehr, i.e. British, Canadian, French, Belgian, and Dutch units. They would like to see these troops added to the total that serves as the basis for future cuts, i.e. more than 460,000 men. Thus, far more U.S. troops

would have to be withdrawn than originally scheduled (which might well fit into the Bush administration's budget cutting program) or, conversely, the troop cuts would be applied to the other countries, excepting France which is not a member of NATO. Although the Bundeswehr is not a topic of discussion, the pressure on the FRG to do its utmost to maintain the actual strength of its armed forces is on the rise.

It is an obvious dilemma. As things stand at present, the Soviet Union can scarcely rely on the combat effectiveness of the armed forces of its Polish, Czechoslovak, East German, and Bulgarian allies in case of a conflict with NATO. The Soviet Union itself is hardly in a position to maintain its military power at past levels unless it is prepared to pay the price of forfeiting perestroika. The Soviets need a compromise in Vienna but are scarcely able to agree to NATO superiority in the bargain. They are therefore inevitably focusing their interest in disarmament not only on America but also on Bonn, and so are their unwilling allies who are seeking freedom. All of them are yearning for liberation from the Soviet yoke.

Under the circumstances, the FRG is walking a tightrope between the expectations of the East and the growing mistrust of its Western allies. Even more urgently than its European partners the Bonn government must wish for success at the disarmament talks. And next year, if the situation arises, it must not hesitate to take additional, courageous steps to make peace in Europe more secure.

U.S. Chemical Weapons Removal Reported

AU2712205789 *Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German*
25 Dec 89 pp 58-63

[Text] Recently, hundreds of trees were cut down in Miesau, Rhineland-Palatinate. The forest lined a railroad track, which must not under any circumstances be endangered by the falling of a rotten tree next summer.

These tracks are to carry what is probably the most uncanny load that has ever been transported by railroad in the FRG: Tonnes of lethal combat gases of the types Sarin and VX.

A train accident would have unimaginable consequences. According to the calculations of the Mainz chemist Werner Dosch, one single tank load of VX alone is theoretically sufficient "to kill the entire German population."

The poison gas VX has a similar effect as E 605. The devilish substance blocks a vital enzyme ("cholinesterase"), the muscles of the poisoned person convulse, the victims cannot breathe and suffocate in great pain.

The transportation of the hazardous load is necessary because next summer the combat gases are to be taken from secret U.S. depots in Rhineland-Palatinate to the other side of the globe to be destroyed: The highly poisonous substances are to be burned at Johnston Atoll, 700 miles southwest of Hawaii in the Pacific.

The risky transport, first by road and rail to the Lower Saxony port of Nordenham, then by ship to the Pacific, raises a number of explosive questions with which FRG and U.S. intelligence service men, politicians, military officers, and disaster relief officials have never been confronted.

It is disputed:

- whether the removal of the dead weapons is not much more dangerous than their further storage;
- whether the transportation of the super poisons can be sufficiently protected against accidents and potential acts of sabotage by terrorists; and,
- whether the people along the transportation route should be completely informed about the dangers and possibilities of protection or whether, quite to the contrary, the project has to be carried out under the greatest possible secrecy.

For decades the FRG Government has played down the dangers arising from U.S. poison gas stocks in the FRG. "To judge by human standards," the Defense Ministry regularly stated, a danger to the population from poison gas "can be ruled out."

For years Bonn has refused to give specific information about the location of the depots. Even though armament opponents—including theologians Dorothee Soelle and Helmut Gollwitzer—have always demonstrated in front of a depot in Fischbach, Rhineland-Palatinate, where they suspected the largest U.S. poison gas arsenal outside the United States is located. However, asked whether Fischbach really is the location of the depot, Bonn has always just answered: "We will neither confirm nor deny that."

In the meantime, there are serious indications that the critics of armament have demonstrated in front of the wrong depot for years: "There is no poison gas in Fischbach," a high-ranking FRG security expert assured DER SPIEGEL. Depot employees are also sure: "The stuff is not here."

Is such information perhaps a skillfully camouflaged attempt to provide disinformation to the public for security reasons shortly before the big transport? Or is the truth about the horror depot emerging only now, 22 years after the last ultra-poisons were stored?

There is much that speaks in favor of the fact that the lethal combat substances are not stored in Fischbach but rather 30 km to the north, in a U.S. depot in the direct neighborhood of the village of Clausen, which has about 1,650 inhabitants.

The access to the Clausen depot, which may be entered by Germans only under strictest guard, is easily concealed from people who do not know the place. Contrary to most U.S. depots, there is no sign that points to the military base.

Continuing from a dead end at the exit of the village, which is lined by a few apartment houses and a gas station and which officially ends at the edge of the forest, a broad, well-tended road leads into the forest. After about 2 km, the road ends in a long valley—in front of the main entrance to a militarily-secured depot, which shows all the characteristics of a special ammunition depot.

The area, which is about 20 hectares in size and surrounded by several fences, is secured by:

- gravel strips between barriers, where every step causes a crunching noise which is registered by sensors;
- glaring lights, which create a highly visible dome of light above the forest at night;
- massive barricades at the access roads and a particularly solid command and control tower; as well as,
- solid air-conditioning facilities on the igloos of the depot, which are covered with earth and greenery.

The Clausen depot, which organizationally belongs to the U.S. base in Fischbach, was established as a conventional ammunition depot in summer 1961. Six years later, the U.S. military turned the area into a special restricted area—just at the time when the Americans were storing new chemical weapons in the FRG.

The depot in Clausen is controlled, maintained, and guarded by crews of the "59th Ordinance Brigade."

All over Europe, this unit (the seat of the headquarters is in Primasens) has the order to "manage" depots with nuclear and chemical weapons and is directly subordinate to the U.S. headquarters in Heidelberg—another indication that poison gas is stored in Clausen.

The question about the location has become topical again since in Bonn an interministerial planning group, headed by the Defense Ministry, is preparing the removal of the combat agents from Germany. The removal is based on an agreement made by Chancellor Helmut Kohl and then U.S. President Ronald Reagan at the Tokyo economic summit in 1986.

Experts, such as Mainz Professor Dosch, consider the poison gases so dangerous that the consequences of accidents at the upcoming removal will be "disastrous." In view of the suspected risks, Greens, social democrats, and the peace initiatives of the Palatinate call for information about the secret poison gas depot and "complete information" for the population.

Because the route of the poison gas convoy might partly lead across the territory of Saarland, Saarbruecken Interior Minister Friedel Laepple, Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD], also calls on the FRG Government "to finally give up the game of hide-and-seek."

A request by the "Western Palatinate Peace Coordination" to President Richard von Weizsaecker that he

should support comprehensive information was unsuccessful: Von Weizsaecker had the opponents of poison gas told that they should "think about the potential consequences if their demand were to be fulfilled."

A constitutional complaint by Julius Lehlbach, former land chairman of the Rhineland-Palatinate German Trade Union Federation, against the storage of chemical combat agents in the FRG was also unsuccessful.

In 1987, the constitutional judges rejected the complaint by saying that, in view of effective national defense, it is justified "to expect the individual in extraordinary cases to accept a higher risk concerning military facilities than that present in the surrounding of civilian facilities."

Only Ernst-Gottfried Mahrenholz, vice president of the court and chairman of the responsible senate, wrote down an opposing opinion at that time. By keeping the location of the depot secret, the jurist argued, it is practically impossible to take any precautions against a disaster. The population must not be expected to accept this.

Nevertheless, so far no disaster protection plans have been presented which also take into consideration the worst case, that is, the escape of a lethal gas cloud. Scharping, land chairman of the Rhineland-Palatinate SPD, fears that accidents or sabotage might cause a "chemical super-maximum credible accident."

How dangerous the Americans' chemical weapons are, even in peacetime, is shown by figures from the United States. In 1980 U.S. Senator Henry Jackson, who has meanwhile died, stated before the U.S. Congress that he had received reports about up to 4,000 "poisonous leaks" per year in U.S. depots.

In contrast, the FRG Government continues to deny any greater danger. In contrast to the United States, it claims, in the FRG there are no rusted poison gas containers. In the FRG, Bonn argues, no tanks are stored; what is stored here is exclusively ammunition that is ready for use and in "perfect condition."

The Defense Ministry has said for years that the poison gas stored in Rhineland-Palatinate is monitored with the most modern technical methods. Even if this is true, quite a few experts are afraid of the upcoming transport of chemical weapons right through the FRG.

The Red Army Faction attack on Deutsche Bank chief Alfred Herrhausen has revived the fear of terrorist attacks. However, members of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution suspect ultra-rightists of action against poison gas convoys, rather than Red Army Faction followers. "An attack which might kill thousands of citizens," one of the terrorist investigators from Mainz says, would "not fit" the Red Army Faction's "action so far."

The security experts are under pressure of time. As early as summer, the first trains loaded with chemical combat agents are to roll from the Palatinate to the North Sea coast to be loaded there. Originally, the Americans

intended to carry this out much more slowly—until the end of 1992. Now it is to be much faster.

During a visit by Palatinate local politicians in Bonn in October, Chancellor Kohl expressed optimism: "Now the chemical weapons will really be removed from the Palatinate by the end of 1990." Before the Bundestag elections next December, Kohl wants to have himself celebrated as the chancellor who pushed through the removal of the chemical weapons from the FRG.

Therefore, the removal is to be carried out from the end of June to the beginning of August 1990. In the meantime, the hurry has met with harsh criticism in the United States. Thus, Republican Congressman Larry J. Hopkins "cannot imagine" how the population is to be guaranteed a maximum degree of security under this pressure of time. It is unclear whether a comprehensive study of risks, which has been demanded by the U.S. House of Representatives, has already been made. The FRG Defense Ministry refuses to give any information. So far the Rhineland-Palatinate Greens have in vain demanded a public study on environmental compatibility.

Mainz Interior Minister Rudi Geil (Christian Democratic Union) did announce that the population will be informed "at the appropriate time" and "to the necessary extent," but glasnost is not in sight.

In the meantime, the Christian Democrat considers it sufficient to distribute verbal sedatives. At a Diet session 3 weeks ago, Geil stated that a few months ago he and representatives of the Defense Ministry and the FRG Interior Ministry had visited "a depot for chemical combat agents" in the Palatinate. On this occasion, he was given a practical demonstration "why the ammunition stored in the FRG is safe."

The minister refused to give details when questioned by SPD and Green deputies. It is, in particular, because he wants to protect the citizens effectively, he argued, that it is impossible to reveal the location of the depot and the detailed transportation plans.

However, the Mainz interior minister's secrecy seems of little use. Because the poison gas depot does not have its own rail link the highly dangerous chemical weapons have to be transported to the next military rail link—in the U.S. depot of Miesau—with strictly guarded truck convoys on public roads.

From the Miesau ammunition depot, which is located directly at the Mannheim-Saarbrücken highway, the fearsome load (total weight including the transport containers: About 7,000 tonnes) will be hauled on freight trains through Rhineland-Palatinate, North Rhine-Westphalia, and Lower Saxony to Nordenham. Which road will be taken by the truck convoys to Miesau is still open.

The secret plans provide for two varieties of approach:

—the A 8 to Zweibrücken until the highway exchange Neunkirchen (Saarland) and from there on the A 6 to Miesau (distance: About 60 km), or

—the A 62 to Landstuhl, and from there also on the A 6 (distance: About 30 km).

Experts favor the shorter route. However, it is doubtful whether the A 62, which is currently being expanded in the Landstuhl area, will be finished in time for summer.

Another indication that chemical weapons are stored in Clausen is the planned access to the A 8 highway: The special transports are to deviate to the A 8 at Rodalben—north of Pirmasens and only about 12 km by road from Clausen. The Fischbach depot is about 20 km southeast of Pirmasens. Considering the security aspects, such a deviation would be completely absurd.

It is planned that every convoy will consist of about 80 vehicles, of which only about 20 will be loaded with the deadly ammunition. The other vehicles will transport rescue and decontamination equipment, as well as the armed guards and the technical and medical personnel. Experts have calculated that the complete removal of the poison gas will require at least 25 convoys. Every convoy is to be secured by about 1,000 policemen.

The measures do not seem to be exaggerated at all. U.S. scientists have studied the risk that such a transport means. They expect that chemical combat agents released by an accident or an act of sabotage are lethal within 20 to 30 km.

Therefore, in the United States there is the rule to give a wide berth to densely populated areas with cities that have more than 100,000 inhabitants—which is hardly possible in small Germany. In the worst case, fears Dieter Meissner, a chemist from Hannover, "tens of thousands of lives might be claimed."

"Comprehensive security," Professor Ernst Achilles, former chief of the Frankfurt fire brigade and an internationally renowned disaster protection expert says, "is not possible; the politicians should admit this." All the more, however, the citizens have a right to "sober information." Achilles: "After all, we cannot evacuate millions of FRG citizens to other countries."

U.S. experts estimate that the transport risks are so high that original plans to transport poison gas stocks in their own country to a central depot and to destroy them there have been given up. The chemical combat agents, part of which are 40 years old and which are to be replaced by binary chemical weapons, are not intended to be burnt in high-temperature furnaces directly at the eight locations in the United States.

The FRG Government has rejected the Americans' idea to destroy the poison gas ammunition stored in the Palatinate directly on site. It seems to consider removal as the safer way.

In the Kaiserslautern Land Council, the preparation of the removal has already had consequences in terms of personnel. Land Councillor Rudolf Tartert (Christian Democratic Union) unexpectedly took over a sphere of work in September, for which a government director had

been responsible so far: Tarter took over Department 33, which is responsible for "Internal Security and Disaster Protection" and had last been called upon to work in August 1988—as a result of the air show disaster in Ramstein, where 70 people were killed and more than 400 were injured.

Head of NATO on Arms Reduction, German Unity

*LD2712135189 Hamburg DPA in German 1220 GMT
27 Dec 89*

[Text] Munich (DPA)—NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner has rejected the idea of extensive reductions in the Bundeswehr at this stage, in the wake of the radical changes in Eastern Europe. "I urgently warn against preempting disarmament negotiations and making decisions which would be detrimental to our security, in view of the risks and instability inherent in a process of radical change," Woerner said in an interview with the magazine QUICK which was released today.

The West remains "weaker militarily." It is important "to devote all forces now to continuing the disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union." He is confident "that we will achieve disarmament in the conventional sphere by next year."

In the QUICK interview, the NATO secretary general emphasized the importance of the Western Alliance to Germany. A dissolution of NATO could not be the condition for a German reunification. Anyone seeing NATO as an obstacle to German unity is misjudging the circumstances, he said. "Without our Alliance we will not realize this goal," Woerner warned. He could fully envisage the Atlantic Alliance as the basis for a pan-European security system. "I would not even exclude the possibility that it might also be in the interest of the Soviets to bind the United States into Europe," the NATO secretary general explained.

An edited version of the interview was released to DPA.

'Secret' Plans to Reduce Military Service

*LD0601121490 Hamburg DPA in German 1041 GMT
6 Jan 90*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—According to BILD AM SONNTAG, the Bundeswehr has secret plans to reduce basic military service in the Federal Republic from 15 to 12 months, contrary to the latest official statements from the Ministry of Defense. The peacetime strength of the Bundeswehr would then be less than 350,000 men, the paper reported today in an advance report. An appropriate concept in which the proportion of professional and part-time soldiers rose to around 80 percent and only every 10th conscript had to do his service in uniform, is at present still stamped with the security classification VS-NfD [Classified Information - For Official Use Only].

Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Federal Minister of Defense Gerhard Stoltenberg did not wish to announce this before further progress is made at the Vienna disarmament negotiations, but in good time before the Bundestag elections in December 1990. The newspaper quotes a "close confidant" of Stoltenberg with the words: "Of course, disarmament has repercussions on the size of the Bundeswehr. The Ministry of Defense must prepare itself for this. We have to adjust to a shorter length of military service and shall in future call up fewer soldiers. Thus the proportion of professional soldiers will increase automatically."

Yesterday evening, the Ministry of Defense stated, following demands from the Social-Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] and the Free Democratic Party [FDP] that military service be cut to 12 months, in accordance with what had occurred in the GDR, that such discussions were "at present devoid of foundation." It referred to the fact that there were still 400,000 soldiers with modern equipment on GDR territory and to the resolutions of the Federal Government not to implement the originally planned increase from 15 to 18 months from 1992 if the expected results of the negotiations in Vienna were realized.

According to BILD AM SONNTAG individual calculations will begin this coming week with the aim of "restructuring the Bundeswehr into a training and mobilizing Army." At the next closed session of the Federal Security Council on 24 January, Stoltenberg intends to give a first overview of the latest Bundeswehr plans.

In talks with BILD AM SONNTAG, several deputies indicated support from all parties: The Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union defense expert Otto Hauser proposed new concepts for a type of army for the defense of the homeland, comparable to Switzerland's. For the period following successful negotiations in Vienna, Olaf Feldmann (FDP) spoke of the transformation of an army on active service to a training army with a lower peacetime strength. Once again, the SPD defense expert Erwin Horn also called for military service of a maximum of 12 months.

The Defense Ministry described the report in BILD AM SONNTAG as "incorrect and misleading." Ministry spokesman Winfried Dunkel pointed to the cabinet decision on Bundeswehr planning at the beginning of December, according to which they would not extend basic military service to 18 months in the event of a successful conclusion to the Vienna disarmament talks. However, the duration of 15 months would then stand, Dunkel stressed.

Despite the denial by the FRG Defense Ministry, BILD AM SONNTAG has reiterated its report that the relevant department in the Defense Ministry is drafting plans for reducing military service from 1992. Consultations about plans to reduce it as early as 1991 are scheduled for next week. The paper assured that it had seen the completed plans itself.

CDU-CSU Favors New 'European Security Union'*LD0601110890 Hamburg DPA in German 1006 GMT
6 Jan 90*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—According to a Christian Democratic Union-Christian Social Union [CDU-CSU] political security concept, the European parties of NATO and the Warsaw Pact should enter into a new European Security Union (ESU). According to Bernd Wilz, the political defense spokesman of the CDU-CSU parliamentary group, in BILD AM SONNTAG, [date not given] the neutral states should also be members of this security union, but not the United States and the Soviet Union. These two should cosign the treaties as guarantor powers, Wilz said.

"Our reply to Moscow's questions and security concerns is a new European Peace Order (EPO) whose freedom, peace, and stability will be guaranteed by a European Security Union to be created," Wilz said. In addition, according to a draft paper by the CDU-CSU defense working group, it is planned that the FRG and the GDR not just form a confederation of states. Bonn's goal in future East-West negotiations must be "a European confederation of states with a pan-German republic as a federal state."

For economic-political rapprochement, too, the paper provided for concrete steps on the path to EPO and ESU. Wilz said on this: "Those Eastern states prepared to join, such as the GDR, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, should form a joint negotiating body responsible for conducting talks with the European Community. Thus we can quickly negotiate with the reformed Eastern states concerning the necessary political, legal, and economic alignment so the path will be clear for a united Europe on the basis of common ideals."

The security union could be prepared on both sides in suitable bodies. For the West, Wilz proposed the Western European Union (WEU) as an amalgamation of parliamentarians. Negotiations and success could be best propelled forward by the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Vienna.

Government Dismisses Bundeswehr Reductions*LD0801165390 Hamburg DPA in German 1553 GMT
8 Jan 90*

[Excerpts] Bonn (DPA)—The Federal Government is not taking "particularly seriously" the proposals made by SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] leader Gregor Gysi on halving the strengths of the Bundeswehr and the GDR People's Army. Government spokesman Hans Klein told the press in Bonn today that Gysi holds no government office. FDP [Free Democratic Party] defense expert Werner Hoyer in a DPA interview described Gysi's action as "apparently frivolous." In contrast, defense expert Erwin Horn, for the Social

Democrats, supports the initiative by Gysi for a reduction in military service in the two German states to 12 months. [passage omitted]

Klein said at the Federal news conference that Gysi would be well advised to concern himself with the current problems in the GDR and not issue spectacular proposals that are rather at odds with the disarmament negotiations. Hoyer stressed in his DPA interview that the FDP will "make a vigorous contribution toward making 1990 a disarmament year. However, it will not fall into the trap set by Gysi's proposals, which are oriented on the internal power calculations of the SED." [passage omitted]

Stoltenburg Urges More Superpower Troop Cuts*LD0901112790 Hamburg DPA in German 1035 GMT
9 Jan 90*

[Excerpt] Bonn (DPA)—Federal Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenburg (CDU) [Christian Democratic Union] favors a further noticeable reduction in Soviet and U.S. troops in Central Europe. There is a good chance for this in the second round of Vienna negotiations on the disarmament of conventional armed forces, Stoltenburg said to newsmen in Bonn on Tuesday.

Even today there are indications that this is one of the main items of the second round of negotiations in Vienna, Stoltenburg said. The Atlantic Alliance will have to develop its concept on this before the end of the year. In further negotiations nuclear weapons in Europe, too, can be substantially reduced. The overall precondition is that the process of detente and democratization in Eastern Europe continues.

Stoltenburg is optimistic that the first round of Vienna negotiations can be concluded successfully before the end of this year. The United States and the Soviet Union will afterward each maintain only 275,000 troops outside their own territory. In follow-up negotiations, this figure should be reduced still further, Stoltenburg stressed. He emphasized that there is a continuing need for the Bundeswehr to guarantee the Federal Republic's ability to act in the international arena and its capability within the alliance. Bonn has a "central interest" in the further presence of U.S. Armed Forces in Western Europe.

Stoltenburg emphasized that the Federal Government has no intention of entering into yet another debate on other expectations, criteria and magnitudes of the Bundeswehr plan concluded last December. He said reports that basic military service will be cut from 15 to 12 months are wrong. There are no orders or task which differ from the Bundeswehr plan laid down in December. Stoltenburg refused to comment on reflections by the union on a "European Security Union" and the dissolution of the old military blocs. [passage omitted]

FRANCE

French Defense Minister Interviewed on European Defense

LD2212100989 Paris Domestic Service in French
0720 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Studio interview with Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement by program host Bernard Brigouleix—live]

[Excerpts] [Brigouleix] Our guest this morning is Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement, who whether he likes it or not is today one of the main protagonists of the controversy among socialists about the management and the main policy lines of the Socialist Party, since he and his close friends contest Pierre Mauroy's analysis that NATO could be brought to envisage a reduction in military expenditure in view of what is happening in the east. Good day, Mr Minister.

[Chevenement] Good day.

[Brigouleix] Jean-Pierre Chevenement, it is altogether understandable for the defense minister to be shocked when he hears talk of reducing military expenditure, but is Pierre Mauroy not putting forth a real question all the same? Within the global context of the reduction of arsenals in both the East and West can France in general and the Socialist Party in particular shrink from this debate for very long?

[Chevenement] I have already had occasion to say that there are savings which one must recognize should be made and that there are also savings which one must recognize should not be made in the interest of the defense of France, its independence, and its role in a changing Europe and world. And it seems to me that I have already made savings—the military budget was revised, very harsh discussions took place, the president of the Republic arbitrated. I took on these voices and I did so with full awareness, because I believed that they did not call into question France's independent defense stances. All the same, I remind you that the budget comes to 45 billion francs less than was planned originally.

Furthermore, we entered into negotiations in Vienna—we are not going to disarm unilaterally before the negotiations have concluded, all the more so since everyone knows that there is, as it is said, an imbalance—the Warsaw Pact forces represent a potential at least 60 percent higher than the Atlantic Alliance forces. [passage omitted] The idea that we should disarm in the same way appears to me not to take into account in any way the real geography....

[Brigouleix, interrupting] Pierre Mauroy does not say that, he says simply that we could make a gesture, that we could link ourselves with this general movement toward disarmament.

[Chevenement] But we have already made a very important gesture, which is the revision of the military programs bill. You know, that was not easy....

[Brigouleix, interrupting] Yes, the opposition reproached you.

[Chevenement] Yes, we had to use the famous article 49/3 in the National Assembly. I would add that all the same one has to take into account the withdrawal of the U.S. troops, which is anticipated, because President Bush announced a reduction of about 50,000 to 60,000 men last May at the NATO summit, and we know that reduction plans which go much further are circulating in the Pentagon and in the U.S. Congress, embracing (?up to half the U.S. forces) in Europe. [passage omitted]

I believe in our country there is—and this is fortunate, it is a great asset of ours—there is a consensus on the idea of an independent defense, based on an adequate deterrent. France does not threaten anyone. It is not an aggressive country, but it can play an extremely important part in Europe and in the world in guaranteeing stability and peace, and with the partial withdrawal perhaps of U.S. troops, with the reunification of Germany, which is on the horizon, if France loses its military capability, its military assets, it is its relative position which will be called into question. Do the French people really want us to be just a little country, do the French people want France to be like Luxembourg? [passage omitted]

[Brigouleix] In this turbulent Europe, what is the future of the Franco-German couple? Do they still have something to say to the others, above all if the Federal Republic increasingly has its eye on the GDR, where Chancellor Kohl is expected today, and where Francois Mitterrand will be flying tomorrow? And what is the Paris-Bonn axis, or perhaps we should say pivot, still today?

[Chevenement] [words indistinct] I am very attached to Franco-German reconciliation because I know that it has not come about all on its own, and I have always said that it was not a soft cushion on which one could rest. It demands great attention, much good will and even much willingness on both sides. [passage omitted]

What makes France's strength is its geographic position, its culture, but it is above all its military strength, its military capacity, which means that tomorrow it could be the guarantor of a balance of stable security in Europe. France can guarantee European peace, along with others—Great Britain, and no doubt with the support of the United States, and in connection with Germany, which is not a nuclear power. But in the end what makes France's originality, apart from its culture, its richness as a nation, is this military capacity, which I intend to maintain against this calling into question, which in my opinion is quite hasty, whether it comes from the right—like Mr Giscard d'Estaing, who is calling national service into question—or from the left, and I

believe that Pierre Mauroy did not express himself as first secretary of the Socialist Party. He expressed himself as Pierre Mauroy.

Planned Sale of Frigates to Taiwan Brings Chinese Reaction

Sale of Frigates Authorized

*AU0301141490 Paris AFP in English 1153 GMT
3 Jan 90*

[Text] Paris, Jan 3 (AFP)—France has authorized the sale of six frigates to Taiwan, reliable sources said here Wednesday [3 January], stressing that the sale concerned only hulls and superstructures and that no arms were involved.

Several more frigates could be sold at a later date, taking the total number to around 15, the sources said.

Because the light frigates were not armed, they were not considered military material, the sources said.

The defence and foreign affairs ministry refused to comment on the affair.

China had warned France Thursday against the sale of warships to Taiwan, which it considers a province of China, saying the deal would be "direct interference in China's internal affairs."

An informed source in Taiwan said Friday that Taiwan was negotiating to buy 16 frigates in the 3,200-ton La Fayette class, worth about 300 million U.S. dollars apiece, from France.

The Tawian navy had chosen La Fayette frigates over the Ulsan-class frigates of South Korea for their better performance and also to improve Taiwan's relations with France and Europe, the source said.

The French-made frigates can carry helicopters and are equipped with anti-submarine missiles which are vital for Taiwan's naval defenses, the source said.

The sale of 16 frigates would cover much of France's 1989 trade deficit of 6.9 billion dollars.

PRC Opposes Sale

*AU0401112290 Paris AFP in English 1109 GMT
4 Jan 90*

[Text] Paris, Jan 4 (AFP)—China's Ambassador to France, Zhou Jue, has been in touch with the Foreign Ministry here over the planned sale of light frigates to Taiwan, an embassy spokesman said Thursday [4 January].

Beijing, which considers Taiwan a province of China, opposes such military sales on the grounds that they are "a direct interference in China's internal affairs."

On Wednesday France announced it had authorized negotiation for the sale of six La Fayette-type warships to Taiwan.

Reliable sources said several more frigates could be sold at a later date, taking the total number of around 15.

The Chinese Embassy spokesman said Thursday that Mr Zhou discussed the issue with Foreign Minister Roland Dumas. "Our position has been clearly explained," he said.

The Foreign Ministry would not comment on the dispute.

French officials stressed Wednesday that the sale concerned only hulls of the 1,200-tonnes La Fayette-type as well as electronic surveillance equipment. No arms were involved, they added.

The French authorization did not constitute "a change in policy toward China" and did "not affect its security at all," they said. Nor did France intend to carry out the deal "in secret from Beijing authorities, who were informed."

Chevenement Dismisses GDR Troop-Cut Proposal

*LD0701124590 Paris Domestic Service in French
1200 GMT 7 Jan 90*

[Excerpt] Yesterday, the chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism [SED-PDS], the East German communist party, proposed that all foreign troops withdraw from the two Germanys before the year 2000, and that the GDR and FRG defense forces be halved within 2 years at the latest. This initiative has been christened a model for security 2000.

The reaction of Jean-Pierre Chevenement, the minister of defense, to this disarmament proposal is: There are going to be elections in East Germany, and the communist party is trying to gain an advantageous position—end of quote [as heard]. [passage omitted]

Defense Minister Chevenement on Hades Missile

*PM0901124490 Paris LE MONDE in French
7-8 Jan 90 p 7*

[Unattributed report: "Mr Chevenement: 'The Hades Missile Is at Europe's Service'"]

[Text] With regard to the Hades prestrategic missiles with which the French artillery will be equipped from 1992, Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement said in an interview to LE POINT, that "this type of missile is at Europe's service," and he thinks that "these weapons have a stabilizing role." The Hades missile will carry an 80 kilotonne nuclear warhead (around five times the power of the Hiroshima bomb) over a distance of less than 500 km.

"These weapons safeguard peace," Mr Chevenement added, and therefore protect Germany itself by deterring

any conventional aggression from which nobody can claim to be permanently protected." The defense minister thinks that "the Soviet Union will continue to be a very great military power," because "states must be judged not according to their intentions but according to their capabilities." He thinks that "the French defense doctrine is the only one which is holding course in the general collapse of the blocs whose founding concepts are being called into question."

Referring to Mr Mitterrand's New Year wishes to the French people, the defense minister said that "the idea of a European confederation is inspiring and realistic."

"It has always been clear," Mr Chevenement concluded, "that the French deterrent's function was to defend our vital interests. It is possible that the content of those interests will tend to be extended in the framework of the European confederation proposed by the president of the Republic who is still the only person who can make the decision in the final analysis."

Decision on Warships for Taiwan Confirmed

Negotiations Stopped

HK1001055490 Beijing XINHUA in English 0511 GMT
10 Jan 90

[Text] Beijing, Jan 10 (XINHUA)—A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman confirmed today that China has been informed by the French Government that the concerned quarters in France had stopped the negotiations regarding the sales of warships to Taiwan in a decision to discontinue the deal.

Earlier, an AFP dispatch from Paris on January 9 says that France has decided against selling warships to Taiwan.

The spokesman of Hotel Matignon confirmed this report to a XINHUA correspondent based in Paris, in response to the latter's enquiry.

Frigate Sale Cancelled

AU0901171790 Paris AFP in English 1709 GMT
9 Jan 90

[Text] Paris, Jan 9 (AFP)—France has decided against selling six frigates to Taiwan, French officials said here Tuesday.

The decision follows pressure from China which reacted angrily last month when the French Government authorised naval construction yards under the Ministry of Defence to tender for the Taiwan contract.

Taiwan had called for international bids to construct six lightweight frigates of the 1,200 tonnes La Fayette class for its navy.

Defense Minister Comments on Disarmament

PM1601123890 Paris LE MONDE in French
12 Jan 90 p 4

[Text] "Current events are far from prompting us to carry out a kind of unilateral disarmament," Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement said when making his New Year's wishes to the press on 11 January. "France has found the right balance," he added, "by limiting its defense effort to around 3.7 percent of GNP in good years and bad years, by providing itself with a complete but reasonable panoply, and by always strictly applying the principle of adequacy while maintaining a modern and credible force. Wishing for an end to the arms race amounts to wanting each power to moderate its nuclear and conventional defense effort."

Referring to the 1990-93 military programming law adopted by parliament last year, Mr Chevenement thinks that "France is not lowering its guard." "Our equipment budget is increasing at a satisfactory rate, although this rate is slightly less than expected. The main thing is that we have succeeded in maintaining all our programs, although some have been lengthened because of the complexity of some technical developments."

The defense minister then explained his idea of "the Europe of peoples." "Defending the idea of the nation in the world today," he said, "means defending all nations, defending all peoples, and this is the opposite of chauvinism, xenophobia, and nationalism.... It is this Europe of peoples which the president of the Republic has clearly chosen."

Finally, Mr Chevenement announced that the French Government had just given its agreement to the principle of a link between the Thomson-CSF and British Aerospace companies to create Eurodynamics, a joint company in the missile sphere. The creation of this company was made necessary by the British decision to join France and Italy in the project to design a family of anti-aircraft and ABM missiles which will rival a NATO program.

ITALY

First of 2 Italian Destroyers Nearing Completion

90ES0241A Rome IL MESSAGGERO in Italian
30 Oct 89 p 7

[Article by Maurizio Modugno: "The Destroyer for the Mediterranean Has Been Launched"]

[Text] Martinazzoli: "Our coasts need to be defended against a turbulent future."

The new vessel is over 130 meters long, has a crew of 400, and includes missile and torpedo launchers; its task will be to protect the flagship Garibaldi. Soon it will be augmented by a sister ship, the Ardimentoso.

Riva Trigoso (Genoa)—The missile destroyer *Animoso* was launched yesterday morning at the Fincantieri shipyards, greeted by the wails of sirens and cheers of the authorities, guests, and workers in nearby construction yards. In the mid-1990's, its role will be to share with its sister ship, *Ardimentoso*, the task of protecting the flagship of our fleet, the airmobile-carrier cruiser *Garibaldi*. As Chief of Staff Admiral Sergio Majoli commented, the Navy, with the commissioning of this vessel, has almost completed its modernization program called for by the 1975 Naval Law. In 5 years, the two superdestroyers will come on-line to replace the obsolete cruisers *Doria* and *Duilio* and the destroyers *Impavido* and *Intrepido*.

The ceremony was also used by shipyard president Enrico Bocchini and a representative of Fincantieri's labor union to launch an appeal to Defense Minister Mino Martinazzoli for new shipbuilding contracts from the Navy. A lack of such contracts would mean having to fall back on unemployment compensation benefits and running the risk of scattering an exceptional team of planners, technicians, and workers specializing in military construction. This "cry of pain" has been taken up by Admiral Majoli, who noted that the number of vessels in the naval squadron is destined to be significantly reduced unless units going out of service are replaced in a timely manner.

Mino Martinazzoli answered that the Ministry of Defense is unable to take on responsibilities on its own that are the mandate of the government as a whole. He expressed the opinion that, though the Riva Trigoso shipyards are focusing on alternative construction efforts in the fields of civilian and environmental protection, the enterprise should not totally abandon the well-honed abilities in the field of military construction. This is particularly true in view of a "turbulent future" in the Mediterranean, which he defined as "a locked-in area full of challenges in which we could find ourselves forced to defend our interests and our right of freedom of navigation."

The two *Animoso*-class ships will be the most powerful units in the fleet. They are also the most expensive, costing about 1,000 billion lire each. Displacing 5,400 tons each when fully loaded, they have been designed in accordance with naval engineering's most modern dictums, which include silencing techniques, redundancy of vital equipment systems, upgraded compartmentalization, and superstructure reinforcement with kevlar and ceramic composite armor plates.

Almost 136 meters long and 16 meters wide, with a crew of about 400 men, the superdestroyers have dual propulsion plants, two gas turbines that will allow the ships to sprint to speeds of 31 knots, and two diesel engines that will allow the vessels to cruise at a speed of 18 knots for 7,000 miles. In addition to radar, sonar, telecommunication and electronic warfare systems, and a highly sophisticated command and control operational center for air and naval operations, the *Animoso*-class

destroyers feature Standard and Albatross antiaircraft missile systems for long- and short-range air interdiction, respectively. Onboard weapon systems also include four Teseo antiship missile launchers, two wire-guided antisubmarine torpedo launchers, a 127-mm cannon, and three 76-mm cannons, the latter of the "superrapid" type, able to fire up to 120 rounds per minute. A hangar capable of housing two helicopters is located at the stern, where there is also a wide helipad.

Andreotti Proposes Sharp East-West Arms Cut

PM1101154290 Milan L'UNITA in Italian
9 Jan 90 p 4

[Unattributed report on Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti speeches in Gorizia, Portogruaro on 8 January]

[Text] Gorizia—"A new course with the East depends on a sharp reduction in armaments and the consolidation of the law-based state in the East." East-West relations and Italian foreign policy were the key points in a speech that Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti delivered to university staff and students yesterday. The prime minister acknowledged that "all the political forces represented in the Italian Parliament have helped to define a foreign policy line based on dialogue, understanding, and openness." This year this line has faced the major changes in the East and the new relations that the Twelve must establish with the other side of Europe.

"For the third time in a little over 40 years, we now face an attempt to integrate Eastern Europe into a framework of international stability," Andreotti added. "We must refrain from acting in an uncoordinated fashion, so as to avoid old disappointments." According to the prime minister, arms reductions and the development of the Helsinki process are essential: "We must continue building a bridge without avoiding a political challenge that could sometimes seem more difficult than a military threat." In a speech later in Portogruaro, Andreotti added that the Eastern countries must beware of the danger of rebuilding their political systems with reference to a single model.

NORWAY

Disarmament Seen to Increase Need for Satellite Surveillance

90EN0149A Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian
14 Dec 89 p 4

[Article by Kjell Dragnes: "East-West Thaw Increases Need for Control"]

[Text] London—The border barriers are falling but satellites are needed more than ever. The revolution in East Europe has pushed East-West talks on arms control and arms reduction far back in people's awareness. The forces are still there, as big as ever. It is just that the public no longer sees them in the rejoicing over the fact

that border fences are being torn down and walls are being demolished. But in reality the need for independent supervision and surveillance will increase as a result of both an agreement on conventional arms reduction in Europe (CFE) and the unilateral arms reduction measures that have been announced and partially implemented.

However the new openness on military matters as expressed in the exchange of data between East and West may be an illusion. In the negotiations in Vienna on force reductions (CFE) and the agreement that is taking shape, it is clear that the regulations will not spell everything out. They will discuss reporting the location of military installations and undoubtedly both sides will furnish correct information on the facilities they are required to report. But what about those they do not have to report? That is where satellites come in as an absolutely necessary component. It is well known that the two superpowers have been snooping on each other for a long time. They have even included written provisions giving them the right to spy on each other to ensure that the other side keeps its part of the bargain. It isn't called spying but employing "national technical means" (NTM) and the satellites have a very central place among them.

This is all very well, especially in bilateral agreements such as SALT-1 and SALT-2 on strategic arms and the INF agreement on medium-range missiles which went into effect during the last summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan last May.

Textbook Example

But although both superpowers have their means, there will be occasional discussions and doubts may arise, especially with regard to whether they are right when they publicly accuse the other side of cheating. A textbook example of this was the dispute surrounding the big radar installation in Krasnoyarsk, Siberia. The United States stubbornly insisted that this was a violation of the agreement, while the Soviets maintained with equal stubbornness that it was just a radar set-up for tracking space vehicles.

A group of Swedish journalists called Space Media Network decided to investigate. They found a way to see who was right—via the French photographic satellite SPOT-1, launched in 1986, which can see objects down to a size of about 10 meters.

Violation of Agreement

Through a combination of satellite photographs and information from other open sources, Space Media determined that the agreement had been violated. This was followed by a lot of activity and American congressional representatives were invited to visit Krasnoyarsk. But not until last fall did the bomb go off—Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze openly admitted that the Soviet Union had violated the SALT agreement.

It is hard to say with 100-percent certainty what prompted the admission, but regardless of the reason, this is an example of independent control of what the superpowers are doing.

Some 35 countries are involved in the Vienna negotiations on conventional weapons and if an agreement is reached the need for supervision will be accentuated. Both East and West have declared that in addition to national technical means, multinational technical means (MTM) must also be used to make sure that the agreement is observed. But the fact is that only the superpowers currently have means that are good enough for this and even if some data transfer occurs within the Warsaw Pact and NATO, it is still up to Moscow and Washington respectively to decide how much they will pass along to their allies. Another thing is that the political upheavals in East Europe may make Moscow less willing to provide its allies with information. And what about the United States with respect to West Germany which is entering into increasingly close cooperation with the GDR?

All this points to the need for a separate and independent body that can provide information to all the countries concerned in a CFE agreement. The problem is political in nature, a fact that was pointed out at a conference in Denmark last week that was arranged by Japan's Tokai University. As early as 1978 France proposed an international surveillance organ called ISMA [International Spaceborne Measurement Agency] under the auspices of the United Nations.

Political Problem

But the idea has been shelved for the time being; there are too many conflicting interests for such an organ to function effectively. Sweden has chosen another course with its proposal for Project Tellus. Under this project a satellite would be built and data would be sold freely to anyone who wants to buy it. The problem has been the cost and besides this kind of commercial satellite is already in orbit today—the French SPOT-1.

Revelations Possible

But the commercial route may be the right one. A company or a group of companies, such as newspapers or media firms, can collaborate. And the cost does not have to be that bad—an American company has developed a rocket named Pegasus that can send a surveillance satellite into orbit for between \$10 and \$15 million. Space Media Network has shown that good news stories can be obtained from space. Our own study of Kola, conducted by researcher Johnny Skorve, has also shown that even with today's technology it is possible to reveal and determine what a military power is really doing. This study will be issued in a revised and expanded edition sometime next year and will relate what the Soviet Union has been doing on the Kola Peninsula since the original Kola study was published in 1986.

France has apparently considered following up its success with SPOT-1. In January SPOT-2 will be launched, to be followed by SPOT-4 and SPOT-5; these last satellites can see objects down to 5 meters. At the same time they are cooperating with Italy and Spain on a reconnaissance satellite (that can see objects down to 1 meter) called Helios. And the Dornier firm in Germany is working on a satellite called HORAS.

If the pictures from these satellites are freely available, it could make a positive contribution to detente and rapprochement. If they are not, distrust could increase because not everyone will be able to make sure that actions are matching words in the arms reduction process. The statement that knowledge is power is more relevant than ever.

SPAIN

Spanish Government Withdraws From NATO Frigate Program

PM1101135990 Madrid ABC in Spanish 3 Jan 90 p 22

[Untitled report by M. Abizanda]

[Excerpt] Madrid—The Spanish Government has decided to withdraw from the NATO frigate program for the nineties, within which it planned to purchase five ships, official sources at the Defense Ministry have confirmed to ABC. With Spain's withdrawal, of the eight countries which began the program, only Canada and the United States are now left in the project, and thus the development of the NFR-90 frigate can finally be considered canceled.

The Defense Ministry's decision was taken after the meetings which Bazan National Enterprise engineer Joaquin Coello—one of those in charge of the program—held over the past few days with officials of the ministry headed by Narcis Serra. Military sources consulted by ABC stated that the reasons for abandoning the project included the pointlessness of remaining following the withdrawal of five of the eight nations which began its development, and the change in the world political situation with the end of the cold war, "which mean that these major naval programs no longer make sense." [passage omitted]

TURKEY

Columnist Considers Debate on Military Cuts

NC1101092790 Istanbul GUNAYDIN in Turkish
5 Jan 90 p 8

[Column by Professor Haluk Ulman: "The Question of National Defense"]

[Excerpts] The question of reducing the size of the Turkish Armed Forces and cutting back on defense spending has been a matter of debate for some time now. There are two factors behind the debate. The first factor

is the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe being held in Vienna to achieve reductions in conventional forces in Europe. If an agreement is reached at the conference, then Turkey will be among the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries which will carry out reductions in their conventional forces. (However, it is common knowledge that in view of the special situation along its southeastern border, Turkey has asked that a region stretching from the northern sector of Lake Van down to the Port of Mersin be excluded from the reductions zone. It is also common knowledge that Turkey's request has been regarded as appropriate; that is, with the exception of Greece's objection to the status of the port in Mersin)

The second factor is the perception that the Soviet threat against Turkey has diminished. [passage omitted]

The writer of this column is among those who believe that the Soviet threat against Turkey has diminished significantly, at least for now. He also believes that the question of threat must be reassessed and our defense policy and the structure of our Armed Forces reassessed accordingly. However, such a reassessment should not be based on easy generalizations such as "let us reduce our Armed Forces" and "let us cut our defense spending." Nor should such a reassessment hide behind unconvincing excuses such as "Syria and Iraq have very advanced missiles, but Turkey does not. Therefore, we cannot reduce our Armed Forces and cut our defense spending." The proper approach to finding the right solution is to hold a broad-based discussion of our defense problems. Regrettably, this is obstructed by the lack of knowledge among civilians and the monopolist nature of the military.

Before a decision can be made on reducing the Armed Forces and cutting defense spending, we must address the following questions:

1. From where will the threats to Turkey's national interests and territorial integrity come in the future?
2. What is the most effective defense policy and force structure to respond to such threats?
3. If it is decided that a smaller but more mobile, more technologically advanced, and better trained strike force is preferable, as I believe it is, then should defense spending be reduced or increased?
4. If the Armed Forces are reduced, then who will shoulder the task of "creating a nation [ulus olusturma]," a responsibility which originally belonged to the National Education Ministry but which the Armed Forces have thus far fulfilled? If the "National Education Ministry" is to assume this responsibility, then does it have the necessary political will and financial resources? [passage omitted]

Turkey to Get Only NF-5 Planes

*TA1301162390 Ankara ANATOLIA in English
1455 GMT 13 Jan 90*

[Text] Brussels (A.A)—Dutch Defense Minister Ter Beek today announced that no other weapons than NF-5 war planes, already planned to be given to Turkey within the framework of NATO, are scheduled for Turkey.

The Dutch minister said the NF-5 war planes would be delivered to Turkey according to the calendar already set.

Holland has so far delivered to Turkey 12 war planes out of the planned 60.

The planes had been damaged by axes when separatists raided the hangar they were stored in.

Joint Production of Military Aircraft With Spain

*TA1501130690 Ankara Domestic Service in Turkish
1100 GMT 15 Jan 90*

[Text] A joint project with the Spanish firm Casa will enable Turkey to build its own light military transportation aircraft. The decision was approved by the Defense Industry Executive Committee, which convened today under Prime Minister Yildirim Akbulut.

In a statement following the meeting, Akbulut said that the project envisions the joint construction of 52

aircraft. He added that the committee also decided to buy five military helicopters and that the issue of the mobile radar system will be finalized in the committee's meeting next week.

The aircraft will be jointly produced at the Murted installations in Ankara, where the F-16 aircraft are being constructed, and at the Kayseri military maintenance installations. The aircraft, which also have civilian uses, are able to take off and land in short distances.

Army Plans Buying French Mobile Army Radars

*TA1601202490 Ankara TRT Television Network
in Turkish 1800 GMT 16 Jan 90*

[Excerpt] It has been decided to buy, from the French firm Thomson, the mobile radars the Turkish Armed Forces need.

Prime Minister Yildirim Akbulut held a meeting today with General Necip Torumtay, chief of staff; Safa Giray, defense minister; and Vahit Erdem, under secretary of the defense industry. In a statement following the meeting, Akbulut recalled that decisions on the issue of light transportation aircraft and military helicopters were taken yesterday, adding that a decision was reached today to buy the mobile radars from the French firm Thomson. [passage omitted]

22161

40

NTIS
ATTN: PROCESS 103
5285 PORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication, policy, view, or attitude of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.